Donation of
Samuel Agnew
Philadelphia April 18th 1848

34 — 8

129 — 3

20

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Princeton, N. J.

LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

BX 5133 .B5 1804 v.7
Blackburne, Francis, 1705-1787.
The works, theological and miscellaneous-- of Francis

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/workstheological07blac

THE

WORKS,

THEOLOGICAL AND MISCELLANEOUS,

Including some pieces not before printed,

OF

FRANCIS BLACKBURNE, M.A.

LATE RECTOR OF RICHMOND,

AND ARCHDEACON OF CLEVELAND;

With some account

OF THE LIFE AND WRITINGS

OF THE AUTHOR, BY HIMSELF,

COMPLETED BY HIS SON

FRANCIS BLACKBURNE, L.L.B.

And illustrated by an Appendix of Original Papers.

IN SEVEN VOLUMES.

VOL. VII.

LIBERABIT VERITAS.

Cambridge;

PRINTED BY B. FLOWER, FOR THE EDITOR:

SOLD BY CADELL AND DAVIES, STRAND; CONDER, BUCKLERSBURY; HURST, PATERNOSTER-ROW; AND MAWMAN, POULTRY, LONDON; DEIGHTON, CAMBRIDGE; AND TODD, YORK.

1804.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

PROPOSALS for an application to Parliament for Relief in the matter of Subscription to the Liturgy and Thirty-nine Articles of the established church of England. Humbly submitted to the consideration of the learned and conscientious clergy of the said church - - - 1

Copy of the Petition of the Clergy, &c. relative to Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, offered on Thursday the 6th. of February, 1772, to the House of Commons - - 13

A Sketch of Contradictions and Inconsistencies in the Obligations laid upon Clergymen, in order to qualify themselves for ministering in the Church of England, as by law established - - 21

Reflections on the fate of a Petition for Relief in the matter of Subscription, offered to the Honourable House of Commons, February 6th. 1772. With Observations on the Reverend Dean Tucker's Apology for the present Church of England, as by Law established. The second Edition, inlarged, and dedicated to Sir William Meredith, Baronet. By a Member of a Law Society - - 33

CONTENTS.

PAGE

APPENDIX. No. I.

Extract from a Pamphlet, intitled, Advice from a Bishop, in a series of Letters to a young Clergyman [his nephew.] Printed for M. Cooper, Paternoster-row, 1759. Letter ii. p. 17 - - 229

No. II.

Extracts from a pamphlet intitled, A Letter to a Bishop, occasioned by a late Petition to Parliament for relief in the matter of Subscription. London, printed for J. Wilkie St. Paul's Church-yard, 1772, with Remarks - - - 243

No. II.

Extract from a Collection of several pieces of Mr. John Locke, published by Mr. Desmaizeaux, printed for R. Franklin, 1724 - - - 256

Bishop Taylor's Judgment on Articles and Forms of Confession in particular Churches; with Notes, and an Epistle Dedicatory, to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry 271

Bishop Taylor's Judgment on Subscription, &c - 323

INDEX TO THE SEVEN VOLUMES - 351

TABLE OF TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE REFERRED TO 395

PROPOSALS

FOR AN

APPLICATION TO PARLIAMENT

FOR RELIEF IN THE MATTER OF SUBSCRIPTION TO THE LITURGY AND THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES OF THE ESTABLISED CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Humbly submitted to the consideration of the learned and conscientious clergy of the said church.

[FIRST PRINTED, 1771.]

PROPOSALS, &c.

GENTLEMEN,

THE case of subscription to doctrines and forms of worship, composed by fallible divines, and enjoined by human authority for public use, has been so often and so particularly examined and debated, that there seems to be very little room for new information on the subject.

The principle upon which the protestant reformation from popery was undertaken, conducted, and justified, is, that "Holy scripture "contains all things necessary to salvation, "so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor "may be proved thereby, is not to be required "of any man, that it should be believed as an "article of the faith, or be thought requisite "or necessary to salvation."*

* In the Statutes given by Queen Elizabeth to Trinity College, in the Univerſity of Cambridge, the following Oath is appointed to be taken by every Fellow in the Chapel before his admiſſion: "I, "*N. N.* do ſwear and promiſe in the preſence of God, that I will "heartily and ſtedfaſtly adhere to the true Religion of Chriſt, and "prefer the authority of Holy Scripture before the opinions of men; "that I will make the word of God the Rule of my Faith and Prac-"tice—and look upon other things which are not proved out of the

Concerning what is or is not read in the scriptures, there can be no great difficulty. The point chiefly to be considered by the sincere protestant, is, what may or may not be proved thereby. Concerning which, amidst the great variety of doctrines which occur in the course of every clergyman's studies, difference of judgment is natural and unavoidable.

On these disputable points, the original protestant principle reserves to every man his right of private judgment. In forming this judgment rightly, every man's conscience must be concerned; and if he meets with a doctrine which, after diligent and impartial examination, he believes may not be proved by scripture, his conscience will require him not to subscribe or assent to that doctrine, as such.

Had this been duly considered by our first Protestant reformers (who strenuously and uniformly asserted the right of private judgment, in opposing their Popish adversaries) they would more readily have perceived that the establishment of the doctrines they agreed upon in the year 1552, might, in its consequences, infringe upon that valuable Protestant privilege on which they founded the propriety of their dissenting from the church of Rome, and in the event, derive upon them, and their successors, the reproach of overturning

"word of God as human only. That I will readily with all my "power oppose doctrines contrary to the word of God—That in mat-"ters of Religion I will prefer Truth before Custom—What is writ-"ten before what is not written."

See Introduction to CLARKE's *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity.*

their own principles, and requiring of *their* disciples, what they would not suffer him, whom, with respect to a Primacy of order, they allowed to be the first Bishop of Christendom, to require of *themselves*.

Archbishop *Cranmer* was no more infallible than Pope *Leo* X. He could not be certain that every man equally learned, and equally honest with himself, would see the scriptural proofs of *his* articles as clearly as he supposed he himself saw them. *Parker*, his Protestant successor, made considerable alterations in *Cranmer's* system. And *Laud*, as every one knows, had his objections to *Parker's*. And through all succeeding times, from the first uniformity-act under Queen *Elizabeth*, to the present hour, there have been leading divines, and among them not a few bishops, who in their respective works have *occasionally* proved points by Holy Scripture with a masterly precision, which all the wit and learning in the world, can never make to agree with some of *Parker's* articles.

The authority of Synods, Convocations, or other humanly authorised assemblies of divines, is of no more validity against the Protestant principle (the right of private judgment) than the authority of a *Cranmer*, or a *Parker*. We have the united testimony of both these reformers, that, "General Councils, even when gathered together by the "commandment and will of princes, (forasmuch as they be assemblies of men, whereof "all be not governed with the spirit and word "of GOD) may err, and sometimes have erred,

"even in things pertaining unto GOD." [The Latin hath it, *etiam in his quæ ad normam pietatis attinent.*] "Whereof things ordained "by them, as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may "be declared that they are taken out of the "Holy Scripture." [The Latin says, *nisi ostendi possint e sacris literis esse desumpta.*] The premises being equally true of national or provincial synods, the conclusion is equally strong against them, as against General Councils. And the question once more recurs, *Who shall be the judge?* The answer of the protestant is, *Every man for himself.* My vote for a Convocation-man cannot transfer to him the right of judging for me. In matters of faith and salvation, no man can have a substitute or a representative.

We have indeed been told, that the church of England does not propose all her articles to be subscribed as points necessary to salvation. But one would be glad to know where she draws the line, or makes any distinction to this effect. In her XXXVIth. Canon she enjoins *all and every of these articles* to be acknowledged *ex animo*, and subscribed, as *agreeable to the word of God.* In her Vth. Canon she enacts that, "If any man shall affirm that these "articles are, in *any part*, erroneous, he shall "be excommunicated *ipso facto.*" That is to say, (as we are informed by her own Canonists) "accursed, devoted to the devil, and separated from Christ, and his church's communion." See *Godolphin* Repert. Canon. p. 625, 626. Is this an adequate punishment for those

who dissent from her in points *not necessary to salvation?*

It is natural, Gentlemen, to suppose, that you, to whom this paper is addressed, not only see, but inwardly feel the incongruity of requiring of you this implicit subscription, when compared with the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and the general principles of the Protestant reformation. It is highly probable, that you do not find *all* the established doctrines and forms of worship, to which you are obliged by law to subscribe, in perfect agreement with your private sentiments. And where you find they are not, the integrity of your own hearts, and your desire to edify the people committed to you, as public teachers, in truth and sincerity, must dispose you to wish to be delivered from this yoke of bondage, which every honest man, who, after an impartial and diligent study of the scriptures, differs from the public system, must bear with reluctance and regret.

In our present circumstances, the only attempt we can make to be relieved from this real grievance, is to apply by a decent and dutiful petition to the legislature, to have it removed.

Our ecclesiastical governors having declined to lend their hand towards our obtaining any relief (even the least relaxation of this hard and illiberal condition of our being admitted ministers in a Christian and Protestant church) on the plea, that the matter is intirely in the hands of the civil powers, have left us only to hope, that they will not oppose our reasonable and righteous endeavours to help ourselves.

The only objection that has been made on the part of our church-governors (at least the only one worth notice) is, that if the clergy should be released from their obligation to subscribe to the XXXIX articles, the church would want sufficient security of the *Orthodoxy* of her ministers. But *Orthodoxy*, we apprehend, is a term which, in the mouth of a protestant, should only mean, an agreement in opinion with the scriptures. And for the proof of such Orthodoxy, sufficient provision seems to be made, in the second question put by the bishop to every candidate for priest's orders, at the time of his ordination.*

The great difficulty in framing and forwarding a Petition to Parliament for the relief in question, will arise from the dispersion of the clergy who wish for it, in different and distant parts of the kingdom, who are thereby disabled

* Queſtion. Are you perſuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain ſufficiently all doctrine required of neceſſity for eternal Salvation through faith in Jeſus Chriſt? And are you determined, out of the ſame Scriptures, to inſtruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing as required of neceſſity to eternal Salvation, but that which you ſhall be perſuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture?

Anſwer. I am ſo perſuaded, and have ſo determined by God's Grace.

We have been lately informed that in ſome manuſcript notes on the Liturgy, &c. intitled,—"Amendments humbly propoſed" [by the late Dr. Clarke] "to the conſideration of thoſe in authority," a Copy of which is preſented to the Britiſh Muſeum, the following Query is put at the Head of the 39 articles. "Would it not be of "ſervice to Religion, if all Clergymen, inſtead of ſubſcribing to the "39 articles, were required to ſubſcribe only to the matters contained "in the queſtions put by the Biſhop (in the Office for ordaining "Prieſts) to every perſon to be ordained Prieſt?"

(at least the major part of them) by low circumstances and other impediments, from meeting together, and concerting measures for effecting so desirable a deliverance.

To obviate this, and other inconveniencies, which may seem, on a superficial view, to attend an application of this nature, it is humbly proposed:—

1. That a few worthy and respectable clergymen, residing in, or within miles of the Metropolis, who are disposed to forward a Petition to Parliament for the purpose abovementioned, shall meet together, and consider of a proper time and place for a general meeting of their like-minded brethren, within the said Metropolis.*

2. That previous to the public notice for such general meeting, some eminent counsellor shall be consulted, and requested to give his advice in what manner such general meeting may be procured and conducted without offence, or without infringing the laws of this country; and particularly, to give his opinion whether the established clergy (under the degree of bishops) are solely and singly, of all his Majesty's Subjects, precluded from the right of petitioning Parliament with respect to hardships and grievances attending their particular calling.

3. That the plan of a General meeting being thus settled, public notice shall be given of the time and place of assembling.

* Since the first printing of these proposals, a meeting of the Clergy, &c. residing in or near the metropolis has been advertised for the seventeenth of July.

4. That at the first General meeting, such clergymen being present, as are willing and desirous to forward a petition to Parliament for relief in the matter of Subscription, shall subscribe their names to a paper purporting to be [Qu. association] a list of such clergymen as are disposed to apply to Parliament for such relief, which paper shall be kept by a proper person for the purpose of being subscribed by any clergymen who chuse it at any subsequent general meeting, or during the intervals of the general meetings hereafter mentioned: and all persons subscribing their names to the said paper, *and no others*, shall be considered as associated members of, and admitted to consult, speak and vote in the said General meetings.

5. That at the first General meeting a Committee shall be chosen out of the associated members by ballot, not exceeding the number of which Committee so chosen shall chuse a Chairman to preside at their respective meetings, and likewise at each General meeting, and also shall appoint from among themselves such person or persons as may be able and proper to execute the office of Secretary, &c. to the said Committee, and the said General meetings. This is nevertheless proposed with all deference and submission to the sense of the first General meeting, concerning the manner of electing their Chairman and other persons qualified and proper to act in any capacity for the purposes of continuing, adjourning, and otherwise regulating, such General meetings, and transacting the business thereof, so long as may be necessary.

6. That a Petition to Parliament shall be prepared by the said Committee against the second General meeting, setting forth in the most respectful and dutiful terms the hardship, incongruity, and inconvenience of requiring Subscriptions in the present established forms, of the Protestant clergy of this realm, and praying such relief herein as to the wisdom of the Legislature shall seem meet.

7. That the draught of this Petition shall be laid before the second General meeting, and submitted to the inspection and judgment of the associated members then present, and such alterations made therein as the major part thereof shall approve.

8. That the draught of the Petition being thus approved, shall be fairly engrossed for Subscription, and shall be forthwith printed, and copies thereof sent by the associated members to the Clergy of their acquaintance in the Country respectively, requesting that the said Petition may be communicated to their neighbours of the Clergy, and the sentiments of as many of their brethren thereupon as can be had, sent up to their respective correspondents of the association, to be communicated to the General meeting, with power to such correspondents respectively to subscribe the names of so many of the country Clergy, as approve of the proceeding, to the said Petition.

9. That to give time for the several answers to be received from the country, the General meetings shall be adjourned from time to time, (the intervals not to exceed fourteen days) during the space of six [eight or ten] months,

after which it may be supposed the sense of so many of the Clergy in different parts of the kingdom as are disposed to join in or forward such Petition, may in a great measure be known.

10. That a Book or Books be provided to enter and record the whole proceedings, as well of the General meetings, as of the several Committees, to be deposited hereafter in some public Library or Museum, to perpetuate the memory of so important a transaction, that whatever may be the event, our successors may see, there have not been wanting among their brethren, men, who employed their best endeavours to obtain relief from a grievance by which, it may well be supposed, many more have been distressed for two centuries past, than have been willing to complain.

11. That before the expiration of the said six [eight or ten] months, (some worthy member or members of the Honourable House of Commons being prevailed with to present the said Petition) six of the associated members, and no more, shall be chosen by ballot at a General meeting to attend the Honourable House with the said Petition, and then the event submitted to the providence of a good and merciful GOD, and the wisdom and piety of a Christian and Protestant Legislature, to whom may GOD in all things give the spirit of understanding and the fear of the LORD through JESUS CHRIST. Amen.

COPY OF

THE

PETITION of the CLERGY, &c.

RELATIVE TO

SUBSCRIPTION

TO THE

THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES,

Offered on

Thursday the 6th. of FEBRUARY,

1772,

TO THE

HOUSE of COMMONS.

COPY, &c.

To the Honourable the COMMONS of Great Britain, in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of certain of the Clergy of the Church of England, and of certain of the two Professions of Civil Law and Physic, and others, whose names are hereunto subscribed,

Sheweth,

THAT your petitioners apprehend themselves to have certain rights and privileges which they hold of God only, and which are subject to his authority alone. That of this kind is the free exercise of their own reason and judgment, whereby they have been brought to, and confirmed in, the belief of the christian religion, as it is contained in the Holy Scriptures. That they esteem it a great blessing to live under a constitution, which, in its original principles, ensures to them the full and free profession of their faith, having asserted the authority and sufficiency of Holy Scriptures in—"All things "necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is "not read therein, nor may be proved there-"by, is not to be required of any man that it "should be believed as an article of the faith,

" or be thought requisite or necessary to sal-
" vation." That your petitioners do conceive that they have a natural right, and are also warranted by those original principles of the reformation from Popery, on which the church of England is constituted, to judge in searching the Scriptures each man for himself, what may or may not be proved thereby. That they find themselves, however, in a great measure precluded the enjoyment of this invaluable privilege by the laws relating to subscription; whereby your petitioners are required to acknowledge certain articles and confessions of faith and doctrine, drawn up by fallible men, to be all and every of them agreeable to the said Scriptures. Your petitioners therefore pray, that they may be relieved from such an imposition upon their judgment, and be restored to their undoubted right as Protestants of interpreting Scripture for themselves, without being bound by any human explications thereof, or required to acknowledge, by subscription or declaration, the truth of any formulary of religious faith and doctrine whatsoever, beside Holy Scripture itself.

That your petitioners not only are themselves aggrieved by subscription, as now required, (which they cannot but consider as an encroachment on their rights, competent to them both as men and as members of a Protestant establishment) but with much grief and concern apprehend it to be a great hinderance to the spreading of Christ's true religion: as it tends to preclude, at least to discourage, further enquiry into the true sense of Scripture,

to divide communions, and cause mutual dislike between fellow Protestants: as it gives a handle to unbelievers to reproach and vilify the clergy, by representing them (when they observe their diversity of opinion touching those very articles which were agreed upon for the sake of avoiding the diversities of opinion) as guilty of prevarication, and of accommodating their faith to lucrative views or political considerations: as it affords to Papists, and others disaffected to our religious establishment, occasion to reflect upon it as inconsistently framed, admitting and authorizing doubtful and precarious doctrines, at the same time that Holy Scripture alone is acknowledged to be certain, and sufficient for salvation: as it tends (and the evil daily increases) unhappily to divide the clergy of the establishment themselves; subjecting one part thereof, who assert but their Protestant privilege to question every human doctrine, and bring it to the test of Scripture, to be reviled, as well from the pulpit as the press; by another part, who seem to judge the articles they have subscribed to be of equal authority with the Holy Scripture itself: And, lastly, as it occasions scruples and embarrassments of conscience to thoughtful and worthy persons in regard to entrance into the ministry, or chearful continuance in the exercise of it.

That the clerical part of your petitioners, upon whom it is peculiarly incumbent, and who are more immediately appointed by the state, to maintain and defend the truth as it is in Jesus, do find themselves under a great re-

straint in their endeavours herein, by being obliged to join issue with the adversaries of revelation, in supposing the one true sense of Scripture to be expressed in the present established system of faith, or else to incur the reproach of having departed from their subscriptions, the suspicion of insincerity, and the repute of being ill-affected to the church; whereby their comfort and usefulness among their respective flocks, as well as their success against the adversaries of our common Christianity, are greatly obstructed.

That such of your petitioners as have been educated with a view to the several professions of Civil Law and Physic, cannot but think it a great hardship to be obliged (as are all in one of the Universities, even at their first admission or matriculation, and at an age so immature for disquisitions and decisions of such moment) to subscribe their unfeigned assent to a variety of theological propositions, concerning which their private opinions can be of no consequence to the public, in order to entitle them to academical degrees in those faculties; more especially as the course of their studies, and attention to their practice respectively, afford them neither the means nor the leisure to examine whether, and how far such propositions do agree with the word of God.

That certain of your petitioners have reason to lament, not only their own, but the too probable misfortune of their sons, who, at an age before the habit of reflection can be formed, or their judgment matured, must, if the present mode of subscription remains, be irrecoverably bound down in points of the highest

consequence to the tenets of ages less informed than their own.

That, whereas the first of the three articles, enjoined by the thirty-sixth canon of the church of England to be subscribed, contains a recognition of his Majesty's supremacy in all causes ecclesiastical and civil, your petitioners humbly presume, that every security, proposed by subscription to the said article, is fully and effectually provided for by the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, prescribed to be taken by every deacon and priest at their ordination, and by every graduate in both universities. Your petitioners, nevertheless, are ready and willing to give any farther testimony which may be thought expedient, of their affection for his Majesty's person and government, of their attachment and dutiful submission in church and state, of their abhorrence of the unchristian spirit of popery, and of all those maxims of the church of Rome which tend to enslave the consciences, or to undermine the civil or religious liberty, of a free Protestant people.

Your petitioners, in consideration of the premises, do now humbly supplicate this honourable house, in hope of being relieved from an obligation so incongruous with the right of private judgment, so pregnant with danger to true religion, and so productive of distress to many pious and conscientious men, and useful subjects of the state; and in that hope look up for redress, and humbly submit their cause, under God, to the wisdom and justice of a British parliament, and the piety of a Protestant king.

And your petitioners shall ever pray, &c.

A SKETCH

OF

CONTRADICTIONS and INCONSISTENCIES

IN THE

OBLIGATIONS laid upon CLERGYMEN,

IN ORDER TO QUALIFY THEMSELVES FOR MINISTERING IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, AS BY LAW ESTABLISHED.

[FIRST PRINTED, 1772.]

A SKETCH, &c.

THE thirty-sixth Canon injoins, that *for avoiding all ambiguities*—the Subscriber to the three articles there mentioned, "shall subscribe in this order and form of words, setting down both his christian and sirname, *viz.* "I. N. N. *do willingly, and ex animo, subscribe to these three Articles above-mentioned, and to all things that are contained in them.*"

Among other things to be thus subscribed are these: "That the book of common prayer, and of ordaining bishops, priests and deacons, containeth in it nothing contrary to the word of God; and that all and every the 39 articles of religion are agreeable to the word of God."

As this form of subscription is required for the purpose of *avoiding all ambiguities*, the distinction between subscribing to the said *three* articles, and subscribing to the *thirty-nine* articles, (mentioned by the late Dr. Nicholls, and others) as if they were two different things, is totally inadmissible, as well as all schemes of *Latitude*, as these must imply, that there *are* ambiguities either in the articles themselves, or in the form of subscription; or lastly, in the meaning of the subscriber.

The *sixth* article of the church of England declares, that " holy scripture containeth all " things necessary to salvation; so that what- " soever is not read therein, nor may be pro- " ved thereby, is not to be required of any " man, that it should be believed as an article " of the faith, or be thought requisite or ne- " cessary to salvation."

Dr. Thomas Rogers, whose exposition of the 39 articles, is said in the title-page, *to have been perused, and by the lawful authority of the church of* England *allowed to be public;* for proof of this *sixth* article, appeals to the following scriptures, *Deut.* iv. 2. xii. 32. *Josh.* i. 7. *Prov.* xxx. 5, 6. *Apoc.* xx. 18, 19. which texts import strong prohibitions to *add* to the word of God, or to *deviate* from it to the right hand or to the left.

But it is most manifest that in *other* articles there are very considerable *additions* to the word of God; and, as these *additions* must be subscribed and acknowledged by all subscribers in the terms prescribed by the canon, *all* for *the avoidance of ambiguity;* the subscribers are thereby obliged to disobey the solemn prohibitions contained in the texts above mentioned, even when, by their subscribing this *sixth* article, they are professing their obedience to them.

Mr. Welchman, in his latin tract on these articles, seems to have been aware of the *impropriety* of subjoining these glaring texts to any part of a system which so repeatedly contradicts them, and therefore totally omits them;*

* The fourth Edition is here uſed, of 1724.

but gives us in proof of the article, 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16, 17. and Matth. xv. 9. In the former of which passages, the *sufficiency* of the scriptures *to make men wise unto salvation,* is asserted; and in the other, a declaration that *they who teach for doctrines the commandments of men* (or as it is in *Isaiah,* from whence the passage is cited, *who teach the fear of God by the precepts of men) worship God in vain.* These texts indeed amount to much the same thing as those cited by Rogers, and equally condemn all *additions,* which can only imply the *insufficiency* of the scriptures *to make us wise unto salvation,* and the necessity of the *precepts and commandments of men,* to supply the supposed deficiencies in the *precepts and commandments of God.* They therefore who are required to subscribe this article in the sense of these scriptures, cannot be required to subscribe a number of *additional* doctrines contained in the other articles, and established as matters of *Faith,* without manifest contradiction to these scriptures.

Among other propositions inconsistent with this article, and these scriptures, is that clause in the *twentieth,* which asserts, that *the church hath authority in controversies of faith.* This destroys the appeal in the *sixth* article to the scriptures, as having an *exclusive* authority of deciding controversies of faith, and is a reviving of the romish error noted by Dr. Rogers, *viz.* That *the authority of the church, is greater than that of the sacred scripture.* And accordingly when he [Rogers] comes to expound this clause, he acknowledges, that this authority

is given [not only] to the church [as a convocation of clergymen] but, *to every member of sound judgment in the same*, whether he is a clerk or not: and all the texts he quotes import only, that every man, even a bishop, must confine himself to the doctrine of the *faithful word*, and therefore can have no more authority in controversies of faith, than any other man. But Mr. Welchman tells us another story; and for an explanation of this clause, sends us to Mason, Hooker, Potter and Field, who all of them proceed upon the principle of the romish tenet above mentioned; and, in effect, set the *sixth* article wholly aside. The texts brought by Mr. Welchman to prove the doctrine of this clause in *his own* sense, are, *Tit.* iii 10. *A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition, reject*; and 1 *Tim.* i. 3.—*That thou mightest charge some that they preach no other doctrine.* How he would apply these texts towards proving the authority of the church in controversies of *Faith*, does not appear; nor indeed does any thing else in his operations upon this article, but that the church *pretends to*, or *assumes* this authority to herself, without any warrant from the word of God.

For in the end of the same article it is said, that, "as the church ought not to decree any "thing AGAINST holy writ, so BESIDES the "same ought it not to enforce," (the latin word is, *obtrudere*) "any thing to be *believed*,* for "necessity of salvation."

But who shall be judge? For the liberty of

* There is a various reading in the different copies of our Eng-

private judgment, granted in the *sixth* article, is wholly taken away, by the first clause of the *twentieth:* and the church will never acknowledge, either that she decides controversies of faith, by her authority *against* holy writ, or *obtrudes* any thing *besides* holy writ, to be believed for necessity of salvation.

However, if the 39 articles are to be considered as *expoundings* of scripture, it is a matter of fact that the church hath *obtruded* some propositions, (or enforced them by requiring subscription to them) to be believed for necessity of salvation; which many serious, sensible, and learned christians have judged to be *repugnant* to holy writ; and *others* which are *besides* holy writ, as not being mentioned in the same.

As subscription to these articles, attended with all this perplexity, confusion, and inconsistency, is, on this account, grievous to every one of whom it is required, so is it the more particularly grievous to clergymen of the established church.

Candidates for priest's orders, within a day or two after the time of subscribing to the liturgy and thirty-nine articles, that is, at the time of their ordination, have the following questions put to them.

"Are you persuaded that the holy scriptures

lish Articles. In the *Collection* of Articles, Canons, Injunctions, &c. printed by *John Basket*, printer to the Queen's most excellent Majesty 1713, the word is, *delivered*; it is remarkable enough, that this variation should have escaped notice so long, as this *Collection* was made, and probably authorized by the bishops, to accommodate the inferior clergy, who cannot afford the expence of the Ordinances dispersed in books of considerable price.

" contain sufficiently all doctrine required of " necessity for eternal salvation, through faith " in Jesus Christ : and are you determined " out of the said scriptures to instruct the peo- " ple committed to your charge, and to teach " nothing as required of necessity to eternal " salvation, but that which you shall be per- " suaded may be concluded and proved by the " scripture ?"

To which the candidate answers,—" I am " so persuaded, and am so determined by God's " grace."

Nothing can be more solemn than this declaration of the candidate, whether we consider the circumstances with which it is taken, or the substance of the declaration itself. It is to be considered as a vow, *deliberately* and *voluntarily* made, and from which the maker cannot depart, without forfeiting the character of a faithful christian teacher. By this declaration, however, he, with the knowledge and consent of the bishop, before whom he had subscribed the articles, recovers his *christian liberty*, which he had before given up by his subscription. The whole matter is put upon his own *persuasion*, both with respect to the exclusive *authority*, and the *contents* of the scriptures ; and he here openly retracts his former subscription, so far as it refers to propositions in the articles, which, in his *persuasion*, are either *contradictory* or *additional* to the word of God.

The candidate is farther interrogated— " Will you be diligent in prayers, and in read- " ing of the holy scriptures, and such studies " as help to the knowledge of the same, lay-

" ing aside the study of the world and the " flesh ?"

To which the candidate answers—" I will " endeavour myself so to do, the Lord being " my helper."

Here the same church which hath so lately shewn her *authority in controversies of faith*, by requiring the candidate to give it under his hand, *that all and every the 39 articles of religion, are agreeable to the word of God*, supposes the said candidate to be deficient in his *knowledge* of the scriptures, and consequently deficient in his knowledge whether all and every the 39 articles, are agreeable to the word of God, or not ; and accordingly exacts from him a solemn promise, that he will by diligent prayer, reading of the scriptures, and by such farther studies as may be helpful to this end, endeavour to acquire or improve his knowledge; which he cannot do, but by the full and free use and exercise of his own senses, understanding and judgment, according to the measure of capacity, with which it shall please God to qualify him ; and all our experience hath shewn from innunerable instances, that, with respect to those who fulfill this promise to the utmost of their abilities, there is more than a possibility, that they should be persuaded in their progress, that all and every of the 39 articles are NOT agreeable to the word of God. And here again, with the consent and encouragement of the church, the candidate is restored to that liberty of private judgment, which by his *unambiguous* subscription to the 39 articles he had just before given up.

And yet (what must appear strangely inconsistent in the constitution of a protestant church) this same candidate, notwithstanding these solemn declarations, shall not be licensed to serve a cure, or be instituted into a benefice, or collated to a dignity, below that of a bishop, except he once more subscribes, *without ambiguity*, these same thirty-nine articles, and thereby once more resigns his liberty of private judgment to the authority of the church; and that perhaps after 30, 40 or 50 years spent in prayers and studies, and endeavours to understand the scriptures, and after a full *persuasion* for the greater part of that time, that not one man in ten thousand can without *ambiguity*, subscribe to the 39 articles in the terms of the 36th canon, or declare his unfeigned assent and consent to the same, as all beneficed clergymen of the established church are obliged to do.

And it is humbly suggested, to those to whom it chiefly belongs to redress this grievance of a learned and conscientious clergy, that while the ordination office remains in its present form, and these promises are exacted of the clergy, any other formulary proposed and substituted for subscription, instead of the 39 articles, (other than the holy scriptures themselves); whether by correcting and modifying the said articles, or by establishing any other creed or confession, of merely human device and human composition, will be liable to the same inconsistency with the promises and stipulations in the said ordination office, as the subscription to the 39 articles in their present state is, as

hath abundantly appeared by the various expedients proposed of late for this purpose; which, by whatsoever authority or sanction they may be established, still are no more than the conceits of particular men, abounding in their own sense; and through a sort of ambition wholly unjustifiable in the constitution of a protestant church, desirous of *having dominion over the faith* of their brethren and fellow servants.

Feathers Tavern, Strand,
December 3, 1772.

By Order of the Committee of the Associated Clergy.

REFLECTIONS

ON THE FATE OF A

PETITION

For RELIEF in the MATTER of

SUBSCRIPTION,

Offered to the Honourable HOUSE of COMMONS,
February 6th, 1772.

WITH

OBSERVATIONS on the Reverend Dean TUCKER's APOLOGY for the present CHURCH of ENGLAND, as by Law established.

The SECOND EDITION, inlarged, and dedicated to Sir WILLIAM MEREDITH, Baronet.

By a Member of a Law Society.

Domine DECANE, *vos eſtis iratus !*
LUTHER.

[FIRST PRINTED, MDCCLXXIV.]

Nec gratius aliquid vel Deo Patri, vel Salvatori nostro, vel Doctrinæ Ecclesiæve Christianæ ejusque celeberrimæ parti, Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, facturum me esse existimo, quàm Patri cœlesti cui soli competit jus conscientiæ leges figendi, Christoque, qui unicus Ecclesiæ dux et magister est, integram illam condendi Articulos Fidei Αὐθεντιαν tribuendo, quam non nisi summo Ecclesiæ et Fidei nostræ detrimento, Patribus et Conciliis adscripsit non tantùm Ecclesia Romana, sed ij qui Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ præ ceteris genuinos Filios, immo Antistites se esse gloriantur, tamen Articulo sexto ejusdem Ecclesiæ aut palam cum Thorndicio nostrate renunciant, aut Doctrinas ἀγραφους introducendo, de Sacerdotio, propriè sic dicto, de Precibus pro mortuis celebrandis, atque alijs ejusdem generis permultis, eidem clanculum adversantur, et reformatæ Ecclesiæ unicum Fundamentum radicitus evellunt. Hæc diu mæstusque conspexi.

WHITBY.

Confessionis subscriptio, si hoc animo exigatur, ut testimonium præbeat omnimodi consensus, *periculosa* est ; si vero hac mente, ut ne in posterum quidem dissentire liceat, *tyrannica*.

GROTIUS.

DEDICATION.

To Sir WILLIAM MEREDITH, Bart.

SIR,

A VERBAL acknowledgement, though expressed in the warmest language of gratitude, would bear no proportion to the value of that generous assistance you gave to the supplicants whose cause is pleaded in the following tract, on the memorable sixth of February, 1772.

But inadequate as the meagre tribute of praise may be to the substantial services it is intended to acknowledge, it will, in the present case, serve to convince the public, that the associated petitioners for relief in the matter of subscription, were not more respectable for the merits of their cause, than happy in the patronage of an advocate, whose good sense and benevolence induced him to espouse the party of a few honest men, against a very general prejudice, strengthened and encouraged by that formidable leader, THE FASHION OF THE TIMES.

Good sense and benevolence, however, under the restraints of a fear of giving offence, would have done nothing for such clients as put themselves under your conduct in their application to Parliament. The man who with a view of reforming public errors separates himself from the common vogue of his contemporaries, will have occasion for an uncommon degree of courage to encounter the combinations of interested and indolent men, whom the fear on the one side, of diminishing their emoluments, and on the other, of increasing their labours never fail to unite in opposition to all reformation within the departments in which they are respectively concerned.

Such prospects, worthy Sir, had no terrors for you, nor for other honourable patriots, whom the very nature of the case called forth to plead for the petitioners at that critical period.

What impressions were made upon others by this prospect of opposition, can only be estimated by appearances. The argument was, that " there was neither *prudence* nor *safety* " in granting the relief in question, as having " a manifest tendency to endanger the public " peace, and even the very existence of the " established church." But surely the former can never be a real object of discouragement, where the legislature is concerned, which cannot be supposed to want either courage to undertake, or wisdom to conduct a reformation, in much more arduous instances than the removal of subscription. The other could hardly be admitted otherwise than as a suggestion

ad augendam invidiam, after the plain proof that hath been given, how much the church established would gain by the alteration in an increase of honour and intrinsic worth, without the least hazard to those privileges and emoluments, upon which, perhaps, some of her sons might put a greater value. What apprehensions the *novelty* of *such* an application might occasion, in a cause which had not for more than a century come under public deliberation, one cannot say. Perhaps large allowances should be made for the alarm that is often taken, where consequences are estimated, not by what we see, but by what we conceive is hidden from us. When time has farther discovered the simplicity and integrity of the plan upon which the petitioners are associated, it may be hoped, that in a more auspicious hour, full justice will be done to them and their cause, and the groundless insinuations and pitiful sophistries of a sort of men (whose peculiar office it should be to teach others, that where *religion* and *conscience* are concerned, *secular motives* and *considerations* should have no place) will be found only among the lumber thrown by, when our ancestors set us the example, and gave us the unerring rule for all future reformations.

To lay it down as a general maxim, that all reformation of ancient modes, even where errors and abuses are so palpable as in our present ecclesiastical system, would be dangerous either to the church or state, would have less impropriety upon any ground in *Europe*, than in GREAT BRITAIN, which hath so many

blessed fruits to shew of reformations undertaken and accomplished, when the hazard was greater than it would be at this period, in the proportion at least of ten to one.

Why should not some reformation be attempted, in such cases particularly as are exactly similar to those which set our wise and pious ancestors to work? Why should we not endeavour to improve that plan which we are ready to own was left short, only because our early reformers did not outlive the glimmering twilight that immediately succedes nocturnal darkness? The sun hath now risen upon us, and shines out, if not to *perfect day*, yet bright enough to give us a competent discernment of the faults and defects of the system we derive from them.

In running over the answers that have been given to these questions, we meet with much more *inconsistency* than should be found in the reasonings of those who set up for defenders of *uniformity*. That apology which takes the most with the present generation, and seems to receive a kind of national sanction from the practice of our clerical fellow-subjects, and which is addressed more especially to the associated petitioners, is to this effect.

" If an expedient can be found, which will " answer the end of reformation particularly " in the case of subscription, there will be no " occasion to run the risk of the clamours and " discontents which would certainly be the " effect of a compliance with your petition. " This expedient, we say, is sufficiently af- " forded in the turn which the principles and

" manners of our country have taken, since " the commencement of the current century. " Our improvements in arts and sciences, the " polite and benevolent intercourse these have " occasioned among men professing different " religions, and the *moderation* thereby intro- " duced into our *Divinity*, as well as *Politics*, " have gradually corrected that sourness and " bigotry which, by a strict adherence to an- " cient technical forms, so greatly incom- " moded the liberal minded examiners among " our predecessors. The age is now grown " wiser; and by allowing a large and almost " indefinite construction of the terms in which " those forms are expressed, hath accommo- " dated the most scrupulous with a liberty to " adopt any sense to which their private opi- " nions may lean."

Without inquiring into the truth of this representation, we must suppose it to imply, that if this expedient was not at hand, an actual correction of our present forms would be necessary and unavoidable. If then it should appear upon examination, that this alternative is no better in quality, than those succedaneous drugs which indigent or knavish apothecaries substitute for more wholesome medicines, and which, instead of restoring the health of the patient, exasperate his distemper, it is but reasonable that it should be exploded, and that recourse should be had to the salutary prescription which only can reach the root of the disorder.

It is alledged then, on the other side, that the introduction of an indefinite liberty of put-

ting upon express words, senses of which they were not *originally*, nor are yet *naturally* and *fairly* susceptible in matters of ecclesiastical import, must have a dangerous tendency with respect to commercial and governmental departments of state. It tends to countenance fraud and deception among the people in general, who will think themselves well justified by a precedent established by the example and authority of the church.

It has been generally understood, since the commencement of the protestant reformation at least, that the most substantial aid that religion, as distinguished from superstition, affords to the civil magistrate, consists in the influence which the principles of piety and righteousness have upon the hearts of his subjects, inducing them to civil obedience *not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake.* But of what use would this *influence* be to the magistrate, if the subject should have the liberty of distorting the words of his laws from their natural signification, to such senses as would leave it at the option of the subject, whether he would obey the law or not?

On some occasions the magistrate has been aware of the bad consequences of such evasions, and hath more particularly provided against it, as appears by the caution taken of the obligee in the end of the oath of supremacy: and if in other cases he does not require men to pledge their faith in the same solemn manner, it is because he depends upon the consciences and common sense of his subjects, that his laws

will not be perverted to any purposes contrary to the *intention* of them.

Pretences of *conscience* indeed, in the common affairs of life, would not be accepted in excuse for such perversion. The people are reciprocally interested in the good faith and integrity of each other; and it would presently be seen how little *conscience* is concerned in such subterfuges, should any class of men take upon them to interpret acts of parliament, deeds of conveyance, and bonds for money, with the same license that Dr. Tucker hath taken, in putting *his own* sense upon the seventeenth article of the church of England.

A late casuist, for reasons best known to himself, hath thought fit to shift off this influence of conscience in matters of religion, from the inward conviction of each individual, to the obligation of a mere outward conformity to the rites and ordinances in public use, whatever they may happen to be.

His master had unfortunately represented *religion* under the idea of an *engine*, invented by the magistrate to keep the multitude in order. The disciple, adopting this idea without the necessary qualification which the master's doctrine might possibly admit of, undertakes to defend *every establishment of religion under heaven*, to any of which, it is well known, a *general conformity* could not be inforced, without the wholesome severities of penal laws; or, what amounts to the same thing, without appropriating, all rewards exclusively, to the conformists.

But for as much as the religious establishment of the country where this casuist exercises his function, is supposed to have in it a mixture of *Christianity*, which is not very favourable to the coercions of civil authority in matters of religion properly so called, he is out of mere decency obliged to make room for a *Toleration* of non-conformists to *that* establishment at least. That is to say, to allow a liberty to those who object to the forms established, as not agreeable to the principles and doctrines of christianity, to profess their faith, and to worship God in modes more expressive of their own inward sentiments.

Upon these persons indeed, religion may be supposed to have an influence very different from that which arises from the mere terror of immediate punishment. But still, conformity having the exclusive benefit of all offices ecclesiastical and civil, of honourable distinctions, and lucrative emoluments, this inward influence will be of no use to the magistrate, who in his administration of civil government, cannot avail himself of the *consciences* of men, whom his religious system will not allow him to reward, or even to employ.

On the contrary, the magistrate will consider this sort of men, as enemies to his establishment. He knows that the human mind being tenacious of its freedom, and the human body having its natural demands not only for subsistence, but for plenty, and for ease and convenience in the enjoyment of it, the compound *man* will of course be desirous to accommodate himself both ways; and while his establishment

is considered as a bar to either of these accommodations, the magistrate will always be jealous, that the excluded members of his community are endeavouring to overturn it. In this view, his sole care will be to keep these people quiet, passive, and contented with their pittance, by reminding them from time to time, that the toleration allowed them, is not matter of right and justice, but of mere grace and favour; and that, should they disturb him by any attempts to inlarge their privileges, *strict conformity* will once more be the word; not unlike the expedient of the good woman, who to keep her unlucky boy out of a mischief, used to threaten, *if he would not be still, she would make him say his prayers.*

It is probable that the fellow labourers of this gentleman, even they who are equally disaffected to the petitioners, do not come into this system of universal conformity, even to the establishment of which they profess themselves members. Dr. Clayton, the late bishop of Clogher, makes a considerable difference between professing conformity to the *use* of ecclesiastical forms in public ministrations, and declaring an assent *ex animo* to the *truth* of the contents of them: and Hobbes himself, who makes conformity a duty upon the principle of absolute obedience to the magistrate, reserves to the conformist a liberty of private judgment, with respect to his inward persuasion in matters of faith; "because," as he says, "belief and understanding never follow men's "commands." It is true, he adds, "If the "king commands him to *say*, that he does not

" believe in Christ, he is ready to obey him, as " profession with the tongue is but an exter- " nal thing, wherein a christian, holding firmly " in his heart the faith of Christ, hath the same " liberty which the prophet Elisha allowed to " Naaman the Syrian."*

But by the nature of this instance of Naaman it appears, that Hobbes limited this obedience to the external *use* of, and *compliance* with the *public forms* established by the magistrate, without taking in the case of an individual sacrificing his private belief and understanding, by a personal and solemn attestation under his hand, of his submission *ex animo* to the command of the magistrate; which had been an absurdity too glaring even for Hobbes, with all his sophistry, to gloss over.

But whatever might be the opinion of this philosopher, it is probable, as I said, that a great number of the anti-petitioners, do not go all these lengths with our more modern casuist, who by undertaking the *defence* of every establishment under heaven, must pin them down to rigid conformity in assenting *ex animo* to the established articles of faith, as well as to the *use* of the forms prescribed for public worship. And hence it is that they who have found difficulties in this extent of conformity, have, to relieve themselves, fallen upon the expedient of a *succedaneum*, rather than hazard the displeasure of their superiors in soliciting a reformation.

* Leviathan, Chap. 42.

But to leave this subtle casuist to his own devices. Upon occasion of a late attempt to deliver the yet untutored youth in one of our universities, from this imposition of subscription, (in which you, Sir, bore a part which will ennoble your name as long as the records of British legislation shall remain) this doctrine of dispensing with the *real* assent, *in terminis*, of these incompetent judges, to the propositions to be subscribed, appeared in all its nakedness. Of what passed within those walls, where only effectual redress could be had, we are at the best, imperfectly informed: but without doors, it appeared, that the very nature of the case obliged the *bigotry* of those who defended the practice, to give way to their *common sense*.

"No one expects, said these defenders, that "a raw boy should, at the time of his matricu- "lation, give an explicit assent to all the doc- "trines of the thirty-nine articles." The form of subscription, however, expresses no less; and that *inferior sense*, to which the advocates for the continuance of it affected to reduce its import, in the case of these poor children, sounded just like the sense of a man, who having compelled me to give him a bond in common form for *thirty-nine pounds*, should assure me it would be completely satisfied by the payment of *three farthings*.

The learned Dr. Powell having under his consideration, a few years ago, the case of candidates for their first degree, in the other university, determined, that "they might give a "general assent to the articles, *upon the au- "thority of others*." Consequently, they who

subscribed under the *tuition* of Dr. Powell, might give such assent upon *his* authority; which was understood to amount to the Doctor's pledging himself to the candidate, that *he would stand* bound for the whole obligation incurred by the candidate's subscription, in the same manner as the obligation is laid upon the absentee by the oath of his proxy; *jurabis in animam*, &c.

This *inconvenience* arose so directly from the learned Doctor's expedient, that it was very sensibly felt, and was, very probably, not the least of the motives which induced the *men of authority* to consent to an alteration of the form of subscription. For when it was found, that this and the like subterfuges, would no longer conceale the iniquity and absurdity of imposing upon these youths a subscription of their assent to a variety of theological and political propositions, of which they could form no judgment, and that a *substitution* of something more *apparently* consistent with their portion of knowledge, was become in some measure necessary, care was taken to shift this *responsibility* from the shoulders of *the men of authority* by a *bonâ-fide* subscription, to those of the candidate himself.

The cant indeed was, that for a man *to declare himself* bonâ fide *a member of the church of England as by law established*, was equivalent only to declaring, that he was no papist, or presbyterian. But when the young man,*

* Dr. Thomas Blackburne, a physician at Durham, since deceased, then a candidate for a Bachelor of Arts degree, a Student of Peterhouse.

who chose rather to forego his degree, than to be insnared by this insidious substitution, had desired *in vain* to have this explanation authenticated by the public avowal of those who composed the new form, and who should best know their own meaning, the deception was at an end; the dexterity of the *manœuvre* in increasing the burden under the appearance of an alleviation, stood confessed, and was applauded by the orthodox fraternity, as a *coup de màitre*, which perhaps was never outdone by the most refined politician in an Italian conclave.

The case of the petitioners, it is freely acknowledged, is materially different from that of these *Tyrones* in literature. The former are supposed to have examined, and in some competent degree, to understand the contents of those forms to which they are required to subscribe their assent: but forasmuch as the *agreement* of those forms with the scriptures, appears to numbers besides themselves, to be extremely *problematical* at the best, they plead, that it cannot be reasonable to require any member of a protestant establishment to attest by his subscription, that such agreement is *clear* and *unquestionable*.

The premises are proved, not only by the general use of the *succedaneum* above-mentioned, but by the multitude of controversies occasioned by the different senses put upon our articles by different subscribers, and carried on to great extremities, not by senseless bigots and wild enthusiasts only, but by sober, serious, and learned men, few of whom, per-

haps, would have joined the petitioners in their application, to have subscription to the scriptures *alone*, substituted for subscription to the articles and the liturgy.

Three or four pamphlets published by the Doctors Waterland and Sykes, are sufficient to prove and illustrate the case in question, and to justify the petitioners in drawing their conclusion from the genuine principles of the protestant religion.

The former of these worthies thought that the predestinarian articles were fairly susceptible of an armihian sense; the latter was of opinion, that the trinitarian articles might be honestly subscribed by an arian. Mr. Toplady would undoubtedly say, that Dr. Waterland must have prevaricated; and Mr. Jones of Pluckley would say the same of Dr. Sykes, and both of them perhaps, with united voice, would pronounce these doctors to have been heretics.

Ecclesiastical heresy, indeed, the candor of the present age hath reduced to a very small matter, and the petitioners might make themselves tolerably easy under the reproach of it, in company with more considerable men.

But the common sense of mankind does not want the sagacity of Messieurs Toplady and Jones to point out to them the evils of prevarication, and whether the imputation of it is incurred in a civil or an ecclesiastical capacity, it will always be understood, where it is allowed, to be subversive of the good faith and integrity that have always been thought necessary to cement the bonds of civil society.

The petitioners are not alone in supposing the *succedaneum* in question to be too thin a covering, to conceal the prevarication of those who make use of it to excuse their subscription : and if among those who have taken the pains to be informed of the nature of the case, this *succedaneum* should be found to be the general expedient of *reconciliation*, (as it is now thought to be) the *prevaricators* whom the civil magistrate permits to enter into the church will not be *few;* and he may come in the event, to buy his present peace too dear, by dispensing with an article so essential to the stability of his government, as the *good faith* of the individuals whom he employs in the important office of teachers of religion.

If the alliance between church and state is any thing more than an ideal rêverie, it should seem by the manner in which it is executed, either that the state hath made a very impolitic bargain, or that the church performs her part of the contract very imperfectly. In the present appearance of things, the state pays the church for much more work than is really done, even in the way of mere conformity ; and though the state may chuse, for reasons of its own sort, to connive at this superficial service, yet if religion has any real hold on the *conscience* of the church, the church must be sensible, that her solemn engagements in entering into this alliance, are not at all consistent with her eating the bread of the state for nought. Nor is there any way of reconciling the practice to the hypothesis, in this case, but by a

sort of reasoning, which will equally justify the lay-subject for neglecting his duty in the most consequential provinces where the state employs and trusts him. No one who has his eye upon what is passing in the world, can be ignorant, that the application of this reasoning is making an alarming progress in departments which have no connection with the church; and when this mode of *apologizing* and *dispensing* is become the general fashion, it will be little comfort to the statesman to reflect, that he was able to preserve his present peace by an expedient, which is gradually wresting the reins of government out of his hands.

The petitioners probably were not inclined to lay any stress upon these political consequences. It was sufficient, they imagined, to gain them a favourable hearing, that they professed themselves christians and protestants, and that the principle on which they grounded their petition, was no other than the principle to which the present church of England owes her very existence, and her only justification for separating from the church of Rome.

They were little apprehensive, that the public peace would be disturbed by their endeavours to enlarge the basis of conformity in the matter of subscription; as, upon their plan, room would be left for those who are attached to the doctrines of the articles by the most invincible prejudices, to abound in their own sense upon any point of dogmatic theology they had been taught to embrace. If the petitioners were mistaken in their notion, that the more comprehensive the plan of an eccle-

siastical establishment should be, the better would the public peace be secured, they may well be forgiven this wrong, for the sake of those great names in the British history from whom they derived it.

They had reason to hope, at all events, that the candor and magnanimity of a British senate, in the midst of their anxieties for the peace of the public, would not overlook, in their deliberations, the private peace of a class of subjects, neither obnoxious nor unuseful to the state, who had thrown themselves on their benevolence and compassion in a case, of which every member of that honourable assembly might have some sensibility in exigencies, where the ecclesiastical establishment was not immediately concerned.

Nor were they wholly disappointed in that hope. They found in you, worthy Sir, and in others of their generous advocates, this sensibility breaking out in just and pathetic representations of their situation. They saw this sensibility communicated to gentlemen, by whom they had the misfortune to be opposed, and who could not otherwise escape from their own humane feelings, than by proposing an alternative, instead of that precise relief which they understood, could not be granted without manifest danger to the establishment.

It was urged, that both the peace of the public, and the private peace of individuals were abundantly provided for by the ample indulgence of the toleration-laws, under which, they who were dissatisfied with the terms of confor-

mity, might find rest for their souls among the protestant dissenters.

But possibly there might be some objection to this alternative among the petitioners, which did not occur to those who proposed it. The protestant dissenters are of various denominations, each of them distinguished from the rest by some peculiarity in their forms, either of doctrine or worship. All of them, however, bound by the law, to declare or subscribe their assent to some one or more articles of human device, conformable to the sense of the church established.

Supposing then a petitioner should upon the whole, approve of the system of some one of these sects, in preference to that of the established church, (which however I have no reason to believe is the case of any of them,) what would he be the better, incumbered, as he still must be, with the legal obligation from which he is now requesting to be relieved?

It is hardly sufficient to say, that the government is indulgent enough to connive at numbers of dissenting ministers who never enter into such bond, and yet exercise their function with all freedom. We find the dissenters are full as uneasy under the obligation, as the petitioners of the establishment. They consider it as a sword suspended over their heads by a single hair, which, were some of those who have appeared in this controversy to be invested with the power, would certainly be let fall upon them: and they are accordingly suing to be delivered from this apprehension, by an effectual repeal of the obligation.

The dissenters indeed, and their friends, have affected to distinguish *their* case from that of the petitioners, in that their ministers aspire to no offices or emoluments in the church, nor receive any part of their maintenance from its revenues. But though it was probably to this argument that they owed that degree of success they have met with, yet was this plea considered *elsewhere* as a mere pretext, suggested by the present exigency, to concele their design of rising considerably in their demands, should they be encouraged by the least concession, to propose them.

What pains the dissenters had taken to allay this jealousy, I know not. It seems, however, to be incumbent upon them to give some satisfaction on this head, both to church and state, by way of insuring their future success; and till that be done, I hardly think this jealousy will go to sleep. In any other view, they surely are not to be blamed, for not excluding themselves from applying for any farther relaxations, to which they may think themselves justly intitled, at any future time : but while they keep up their pretensions to farther privileges, their present application will most certainly be considered, as an attempt to open a way to what, neither the church nor state will think can be safely granted.

The plea of the learned Dr. Furneaux for repealing the test-laws, so far as they concern the protestant dissenters, in the sixth of his excellent letters to Sir William Blackstone, is probably unanswerable upon the principles of natural equity. But while his honourable an-

tagonist (who must be supposed to speak the sense of church and state in *alliance,)* insists, that, in case of such repeal, "the idea of a na- "tional establishment would at once be de- "stroyed, and the episcopal church would no "longer be the church of England," the Dr's plea will appear to be utterly inconsistent with that lately suggested by the dissenters, in order to have *their* cause *valued* above that of the associated petitioners of the establishment, namely, the *self-denial* of their ministers, in disowning all design or desire of partaking of the offices and emoluments of the church; for it will be difficult to persuade those who know the world, that the dissenting clergy are so dull and inapprehensive, as not to see as well as Sir William Blackstone, that the repeal of the test-laws would not be beneficial to *lay*-dissenters *only*.

This presumption is not a little countenanced by the occasional sentiments of some of their friends, concerning the equitable rights of the dissenters, expressed in terms sufficiently explicit to leave no room for the ambiguity of conjecture.

"The minds of the dissenters," says a writer of New England, "might probably be more "conciliated to the measure," [of sending bishops to America] "if the bishops *here*, should, "in their wisdom and goodness think fit to set "their sacred character in a more friendly "light, by dropping their opposition to the "dissenters application for relief in subscrip- "tion, and declaring their willingness, that "*the dissenters should be capable of offices, en-*

"*joy the benefit of education in the universities,*
"*and the priviledge of appropriating their*
"*tithes to the support of their own clergy.*"
London Chronicle, *June* 23, 1772.

There is no saying how far this writer was or was not commissioned by his compatriots to propose this compromise; nor how far the Americans in general would think these accommodations of their brethren in the mother country, an equivalent for their hazarding the consequences of establishing a prelacy among them. But certainly he would lose very little credit, who should presume, that the operations of the most adroit prelate that might be pitched upon for the edification of America, would not countervail to the church the mortification of seeing dissenters of various denominations in the high places of government, the gates of our universities thrown open to their unhallowed offspring, or the tithe of an opulent nonconformist carried off from the established incumbent, to the use and behoof of his own teacher.

If these *additions* to the present privileges of the dissenters appear to themselves to be reasonable, they will be frequently thinking of them; and what men frequently think of that may improve their present condition, they will be frequently contriving to accomplish; *attempts* succeed *contrivances*, and one point being gained, they will naturally think of advancing the next in order, till they have surmounted all obstructions and *realized* their whole system.

Let it not be imagined that this representation is invidiously intended to foment the jea-

lousies already entertained of the dissenters by their high-church adversaries. There is not a dissenter among them who more ardently wishes that every protestant in the kingdom may enjoy all the privileges civil and religious, to which his principles intitle him in a protestant state, than the writer of these papers. His design is only to convince the dissenters on the *one* hand, of the *inutility* of distinguishing, in the matter of subscription, *their* case from that of the petitioners of the establishment; and on the *other*, to represent to the zealous churchmen who oppose them, the folly of augmenting the number of those, of whose growing demands they have so alarming apprehensions, by driving the petitioners out of the pale of the church, into some of the dissenting societies; on account only of their desiring the relaxation of a single circumstance in the present discipline of the church; which, besides the imputation it brings upon her of contradiction and inconsistency in her ordinances, is to all intents and purposes of a test, become perfectly useless; and which, whether continued or abolished, would not have the remotest influence upon her emoluments or honourable distinctions.

These considerations, worthy Sir, I have taken the [perhaps *unwarrantable*, certainly the *unwarranted*] liberty to lay before you; without any view, however, of engaging or soliciting your patronage of the following reflections, which possibly may be obnoxious to many wise and worthy men, in more instances than one. For whatever of this kind that may be found in them, the writer alone is *singly* an-

swerable. Several things suggested in this address have arisen from incidents posterior to the first publication of these reflections, and the sole reason of drawing them out on this occasion is, to satisfy the public, that nothing hath hitherto appeared in all the subsequent efforts of their opponents, to render them less worthy of your protection, and that of the rest of their honourable friends, than they were the first moment they were allowed to take refuge under it.

And if the cause of the petitioners, should, all things considered, appear to be of a nature not to be deserted or compromised by men of probity and conscience; and if, on the other hand, the petitioners are rightly convinced, that they cannot be effectually relieved but by the legislature of their country, and that their cause, as the cause of free subjects of a protestant state, cannot be more properly introduced to the means of their relief than by the previous approbation of their immediate representatives, it may be hoped that their repeated application to that honourable body, will not be esteemed an indecent or improper importunity, in a cause with which the honour, interest, and internal strength of our protestant constitution, seem to be so intimately connected.

I am,
Worthy Sir,
With the utmost respect,
Esteem and gratitude,
Your obedient,
And obliged Servant,

THE EDITOR.

REFLECTIONS, &c.

THE sentiments of our countrymen are so divided concerning the petition for relief in the matter of subscription, and the characters and views of the petitioners, and such is the zeal and vehemence with which the advocates on each side espouse their respective parties, that he who pretends to write upon the subject without any prejudice towards one side or the other, must not expect to be believed. For my part, I cannot boast of being more disengaged from partial impressions than my neighbours, and therefore shall not affect the character of a moderator between the litigants; intending only in this little tract, to make a few plain observations on some matters of fact which have happened within my own knowledge, and on the representations which have been made of some others, retailed by common report.

As far as my conversation and intercourse with men of sense and letters have reached, the sentiments of many of them on this subject, seem to have varied since the debate of the *sixth of February*, 1772; when Sir W——m M——h moved to have this petition received in the house of Commons. There were auditors admitted into the galleries on that memorable day, who came there for mere amusement, and with the same sort of vacant curiosity (will

the petitioners forgive me for stationing myself in that number?) which would send them to any common spectacle of entertainment. Few of these had any other conception of the nature of the controversy, than what they had picked up from coffee-house declamations, which left the real merits of the cause just as they found them; and the question was so far a moot point with the public, that, as I have been informed, policies were opened at the usual places, where the petition was *done*, after such rates as intelligence from the knowing ones suggested to the adventurers.

On the other hand, numbers came with the most violent prepossessions in favour of the church, whose very existence was by them understood to be at issue. The bias of these gentlemen was not unknown to some friends of the petition, who failed not to remark in the progress, and particularly at the end of the debate, an astonishment in these unfriendly countenances, which could only be accounted for by their surprize, that so much could be said for what they took it for granted, must be a losing cause. And indeed such was the superiority of the speakers on the side of the petition in point of argument, that the enmity of many respectable individuals, who came to the hearing with the most hostile dispositions towards the petitioners, was greatly abated, and, in some instances, entirely subsided.

The truth is, the zeal of the adverse party broke out a little unexpectedly, and prevented the operation of a sort of parliamentary craft, often projected by the leaders of a majority,

viz. to snffer questions of moment, which have no *ministerial utility* to recommend them, to die away in silence, with some little shew of a decent regard to the subject, and the characters of those who espouse it.

When the question has been asked, "Where "would have been the *political* inconvenience "of granting the prayer of this petition?" The answer has gone upon a notion, or, if you please, a prejudice, that my lords the bishops have been for a course of years in strict *alliance* with the conductors of our civil affairs, and have afforded them a very valuable aid in the determination of several questions, not only such as more immediately respected the general welfare of the state, but such likewise as were relative to ministerial power, and took their rise from very inferior considerations.

"An *alliance*," say these answerers, "gives "us the idea of *covenants*, and of *reciprocal* "*obligations*: and one cannot wonder, that, "where this venerable corps imagine them-"selves to be interested, their *allies* should "adopt *their* sense of things, and employ their "whole influence to accommodate so conse-"quential a band of auxiliaries."

Whether this hypothesis is well founded or not, it was generally understood, that, with respect to this petition, their lordships were parties on the one side, and the petitioners on the other. There are not many in the lower, or even in the middle classes of our people, who, considering the distance at which they are kept by their ecclesiastical superiors, can pretend to form any accurate judgment on the

proprieties in the episcopal character. Some however there are, and a few of these procured admittance into the gallery above-mentioned, on the day of trial. One of them, as the audience was departing, asked an anti-petitioning dignitary, with an inimitable archness of aspect, whether he thought their lordships would subscribe to every thing their advocates below had advanced in support of their cause?

What reply was made to this, I could not hear; but I have been since informed, that their lordships were so little edified by some of the like modes of defence, retailed in pamphlets and news-papers, previous to these more solemn debates, that they found themselves obliged to declare, the writers had no commission from them, and wished their zeal and their knowledge had been more equally matched.

The English have been called a nation of *conjecturers.* * Give them but one fact for a *datum*, and they will build an hundred upon it; some of them founded upon a bare possibility, among others which have a better chance to be brought into existence. The fact to be accounted for on this occasion, was, the hostility of the leading pastors of a protestant church, to a measure, which so many wise and good men have highly approved, and even demonstrated to be just and reasonable.

That class of our fellow subjects which ministerial derision stigmatises with the name of *patriotic*, hath more than once insinuated, that the intrigues of the cabinet have a plain tendency to arbitrary rule. On every manœuvre of that complexion, the clerical powers in *al-*

* Gens Anglorum prophetiis semper dedita. *Guil. Newburgensis.*

liance, will of course be called upon to execute their part of the convention. Their province, upon such emergencies, will be to keep religious inquiry within its *due* limits. "If men are "left free to speculate upon the genuine prin- "ciples of christianity," say the politicians, "they may come to stumble upon maxims too "favourable to their civil rights and privile- "ges. *Ye* therefore *who have the watch, make* "*it as sure as you can.*"

To confirm this conjecture, the four last years of Queen Anne are appealed to. The politicians of that period had an object in their eye which would effectually have superseded the bill of rights, and the protestant act of settlement. The majority of the c.oth, faithful to the *alliance*, were their cordial co-operators. The part assigned them was to bend the necks of the people to the *hierarchical* yoke, by way of suppling them to the *political* one. Instances of their industry in this department will be remembered, without quoting particulars. "And "though," say the *conjecturers*, "the sacer "dotal spirit was under rebuke during the "reigns of the two immediate successors of "Queen *Anne*, it was neither idle nor impro "vident, but kept its muniments in excellent "preservation, against the time when it might "more openly pretend to the patronage and "protection of the civil powers."

I wish I could treat these speculations as the mere dreams of a party; and I certainly should do it, were there not too much verisimilitude

in more recent events, to justify an inquisitive writer for rejecting the *hypothesis*.

There are few passages in the New Testament which have employed my meditations more, than that prophetic notice given by old Simeon,* *Luke* ii. 25, that *the thoughts of many hearts should be revealed* in consequence of the mission of *Jesus Christ*.

Government ecclesiastical has been so managed in these latter ages, even in protestant churches, as to tempt many capable readers of the bible, to suspect a tendency in it to exclude that kind of rule, which Christ and his Apostles have prescribed to their successors in the province of *feeding the flock of God*.

Our common people have been the less aware of this encroachment, as great pains have been taken to instruct them from their infancy, that not only an authority to teach was left to church-governors, by the founders of the christian religion, but an authority to prescribe *modes of faith* and *worship*, in all cases where they should find it expedient.

There is a certain sort of men appearing among us at particular intervals, who, when they get a *New Testament* into their hands, *will* be telling the world what they find in it, though it is ever so contrary to the *bon ton*. Among

* Not the *Simeon*, who in the St. James's Chronicle of February 8, 1772, called the thirty-nine articles the TYE-WIGS of the church; "in which," as a wag observed upon reading the paper, "the church made a figure not unlike the ancestors of a certain coun-"try gentleman, who, disgusted with the simplicity of the garb in "which Van Dyke had left them, equipped them by the assistance "of an artist as tasty as himself, with the full bottoms of the times."

others of this disposition may be reckoned, *John Milton*, *John Locke*, *Samuel Clarke*, and *Benjamin Hoadly;* the last of whom is supposed to have greatly contributed, in his day, to keep the hierarchical maxims of the *four last years* above-mentioned, much in the shade, by confronting them with the genuine documents of the sacred writings.

But he was mortal, and so were his political patrons; and about the time of his demise, certain geniuses arose, who, by putting some of their old wine into his new bottles, amused the world with a kind of *half-christianity*, which kept things pretty well *in petto*, till the taste of theworld was prepared for a more complete adulteration.

But within these last ten or twelve years, some men of more courage than discretion, have undertaken to examine this heterogeneous system with precision, and in the course of the process, seem to have found reason to go farther than even Dr. Hoadly had ventured: namely, to contrast the assumed powers of church and state in alliance, touching the imposition of subscriptions to human creeds and confessions, with the genuine rules of government exhibited in the scriptures, and occasionally acknowledged by the church of *England* itself.

Here the lurking spirit of church domination broke forth in all its glory. In truth, the provocation was intolerable. Matters were going quietly on, in the most favourable manner for the great cause of the *alliance.* The good protestant people of England, had patiently suf-

fered themselves to be told, that no christianity is authentic, which is not taught in the forms of the church of *England.** They had patiently suffered themselves to be told, on another hand, that religion is an *engine* contrived to keep the people in subjection, and that no body knows how to work it but the clergy. And lastly, the good protestants of this kingdom received information, and that from an authority it became them not to question, that popery was become an *inoffensive* system, and that the vigilance of their pastors, heretofore

* "We acknowledge it, WHOEVER is taught CHRISTIANITY "by our care, will be taught it as professed in the church established "*here* by law. There can be no teaching at all, but in some parti-"cular form. We think our own the best. Every body thinks it "far from the worst. At least our converts will have the bible put "into their hands to judge for themselves. And which is righter, "that heathens and persons of no religion, should continue what they "are, or become what we would make them." *Archbishop* SECKER's Propagation Sermon, Feb. 20, 1740-41. Octavo, p. 33, 34. He might well say, *there can be no teaching at all, but in some particular form.* For it seems, though these converts have the bible put into their hands *to judge for themselves*, they must still continue *heathens* or *persons of no religion*, unless they would become what the Archbishop's established forms would make them. We learn likewise from this passage, that the bible, *being no particular form*, christianity cannot be learned by it. And yet it is put into the hands of converts *that they may judge for themselves!* That is to say, that they may judge whether it is righter to continue heathens, or become members of the church of England as by law established. For whether any other christianity is to be learned by reading the bible, is out of the question. What shall we admire most in this citation? The complicated absurdity of the preacher's reasoning, his profanely postponing the sufficiency and authority of the christian scriptures, to political establishments of the inventions of men in the worship of God, or his proficiency in the *Morale Pratique des Jesuites?* Was it for *merit* of this kind, that he became the primate of the church of England?

so solicitous to guard against its influence, might now be better employed.

When the ancient church-system was so hopefully reviving, and gradually gathering strength, when *the jest*, as *Falstaff* says, *was so forward, and a-foot too*, what could be more vexatious, than for these impertinent scripturists to pretend to lay open its deformities to the meanest of the people?

The alarm however being taken, champions in abundance arose to chastise those retrograde sons of the church.* Champions indeed of different complexions, and consequently, not uniform in their defences. Some adopted the political religion of *Hobbes*. Others drew their arguments from the traditional testimonies of the independent powers of the hierarchy; many of these were volunteers. They who wrote or published by *commission*, generally trimmed between the two, and were incessantly drawing back with one hand, the concessions they had given up with the other; with a view, it should seem, of magnifying the moderation of those who set them to work, at the expence of their consistency.

The countenance of superiors could not keep these performances in credit. Common sense

* Dr. *Ibbetson* was one of the first who took fire on this occasion; and in the warmth of his zeal, most unluckily discovered what the hierarchy were then deriving at, *viz. To have the* SAME RESPECT *paid to the clergy of the church of* England, *from the laity, as is paid to the clergy of the* Romish *church*: and it was with the utmost indignation and astonishment, that the Doctor learned from the lamentations of a certain prelate, that any man should have the assurance to express his hope, that *they never would*, and that too in a large company.

was disgusted with the sophistry employed in them, and liberal minds were in pain for the consequences of adopting it as part of the public system. And this probably (for I am in no secret of this sort) gave the hint, that the case being now before the public, a proper time was at hand to attempt a deliverance from a bond, which, besides being contrary to the dictates of christianity, and the concessions of our protestant church, could no longer be subservient to the purposes of uniformity, as they who laboured to support it, were themselves so inconsistent in their schemes of reconciling the injunction to any principles of reason or justice.

Why the petitioners chose the method of applying to the house of Commons in the first instance, I can offer nothing but conjectures: and these I must postpone, till I have attempted to account for another appearance, and to discover some reason why our ecclesiastical governors, who have so long affected the character of *moderation*, should, upon occasion of this *petition*, be so far surprised out of *their usual presence of mind*, as to make no secret of their enmity to it.

From the moment an intimation was given, that such petition was intended, the emissaries of those who lay claim to orthodoxy as their peculiar, endeavoured to load those who should be concerned in it, with every evil imputation that a malignant heart could harbour. At first, this was a *postulatum ex hypothesi:* but it has been continued even to this hour, when the petitioners are better known. Not one of them

is allowed to have acted from a principle of conscience, though it is so hard to say, what else could set them to work.* If I am rightly informed, a great part of them are men of respectable secular connexions, and might hope, by the interest of their friends and patrons, to rise to as comfortable and honourable preferments as the most of those who draw the pen against them. Would such men cut the grass under their own feet, without any motive consistent with common sense?

Though I am a stranger to almost every bishop upon the bench, I will venture to affirm, that their lordships have a better opinion both of the sense and integrity of the petitioners. Some of their lordships are authors, and by what I have seen of their compositions, such of them must be incapable of being imposed upon by the representations of those very indifferent writers, who retailed this calumny to the public.

* One of them, however, has given the world a convincing proof that his motive for joining the petitioners was truly conscientious. This excellent person's conduct so confounded the antipetitioning scribblers, who had no idea of the possibility of making such a sacrifice from principle, that when their first astonishment was over, they set themselves to account for it by the views this gentleman might have of some secular advantage by acting as he did; and accordingly began to make computations of the *gains* that *might* accrue to him by remaining in his present situation. The consequence was, that their several hypotheses being contrary to each other, and their various postulata sublimed into vapour by notorious facts, they became ridiculous, and (as much as their ignorance and assurance would permit) abashed. Perhaps these humane, equitable sons of the church, may by this time be gratified with other instances of the like self-denial.

So however it fell out, that the general cry was,—"The Petitioners are endeavouring to "ruin the *establishment;*" a complex and equivocal term, which some are unable, and others too indolent, or too artful, to analyse. The herd of our conformists take it to mean the stones and timber of a cathedral; and to speak the honest truth, they, who use the word in another sense, and ascribe these lethiferous consequences to an alteration of subscription to the thirty-nine articles, or even to the substitution of the scriptures for the articles themselves, are very little wiser, or else not half so honest.

Dignitaries indeed, of some gravity, have asserted, that whatever the intention of the petitioners might be, this ruin of the establishment would be the effect of executing their plan. But not one man in ten could believe they were in earnest, till one of them undertook to give the proof in form.

This learned divine, however, wanted two *postulata* to make way to his point, which perhaps he might not so easily obtain. What these were, shall be observed by and by.—But the conclusion being obtained, it was natural enough to ask, what was to be substituted in the place of the *establishment ?*—Why—they knew not wellwhat—CONFUSION was the *motte de guerre*—and *Confusion,* it seems, stood for *popery, presbyterianism, methodism, arianism, socinianism,* and what not.

I cannot recollect that the petitioners have taken any extraordinary pains to silence these

clamours.* They are the clamours of an uninformed multitude, by which none will be influenced, but such as idolize the mere word *establishment*, and, in complaisance to Dean Tucker, will look at nothing but through his spectacles. It is well known to all men with their eyes open, that *popery*, *presbyterianism*, *methodism*, *arianism*, *socinianism*, *deism*, &c. flourish sufficiently, some of them in the very bosom of the establishment, others in spite of it. The powers in being could not want the means of dealing with them in time and place, if there were not considerations that over-rule their inclinations to suppress them, if any such they have; and hence I conclude, that however these popular clamours may accommodate the establishment in view of this petition, the *confusion*, as it is stated by the Dean of Glocester, is not the thing which disposed my lords the bishops to oppose it.

Time, which brings most things to light, has at length given us a peep at the true secret. The world, till very lately, had heard but of *Thirty-nine* articles of the church of England. We are now told of a *Fortieth*, consisting, indeed, only of two words, but those of more weight than any two thousand, if so

* They have, I find, been since considered in an excellent little Tract, intitled, *Thoughts on the Dangers apprehended from Popery and Sectaries, by abolishing subscription to the thirty-nine Articles.* —In the learned Dr. *Dawson's* Letter to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of *Winchester.*—The incomparable *Plea of the Petitioners stated and vindicated from the misrepresentations contained in a late charge delivered by* Dr. Balguy to the Clergy *of the Archdeaconry of Winchester;* and several others.

many are to be found in the remaining *Thirty-nine.*

These two words are, PUBLIC PEACE, which for the present, we will suppose to mean, the peace of church and state in *Alliance.*

There are many good things in the *Thirty-nine* articles, among others that are sufficiently exceptionable. We are told that the establishment cannot subsist without subscription to *all* and *every* of them. I don't, however, recollect any law by which the presiding officers in the church are obliged to subscribe them; and yet the nature of the case would seem to suggest, that the more important the charge, the more necessary to take ample security for the due execution of it. Shall we say, that a full *Assent* and *Consent* to this *Fortieth* article, either expressed or understood, is a sufficient pledge for their adherence to the established faith? Be it so; I cannot think, however, that our R. R. pastors would abandon the whole *Thirty-nine* for the sake of the *Fortieth.*

When we consider the transitory nature of the fashion of the world, and even of those things in it which are called *Establishments,* we can depend upon no human provisions for the perpetuity of them. The time was, when a British Parliament had their objections to the *Thirty-sixth* of our present articles, and thought the *public peace* required a pretty remarkable contravention to its contents. Should such an exigence happen again, I cannot but believe my Lords the Bishops would think the support of their calling worth a little contention, more particularly, if a mode of consecration, which

would let mere presbyters into all the privileges of a prelacy, should be the *Nostrum* in vogue. I am convinced too, that their Lordships would risque something to keep out the *fond things* of popery, particularly that *very fond thing*, the waiting for their bulls and their pall from the bishop of Rome.

Upon this view of things, I may, perhaps, be allowed to venture a short comment on this *Fortieth* article of the politician's religion.

"This Petition, if admitted," it is said, "would break the *public peace*. The bishops "are against it, not particularly on account "of its intrinsic demerit, but of its tendency "to disturb the *peace* of the *public*, which the "terms of a certain *pactum conventum* requires "to preserve to all adventures."

This circumstance leads us to consider, in what respects the public peace would be affected by granting the prayer of this petition. And first of the *Public Peace* of the *State;* how the public peace of the *Church* would be hazarded by it, shall be considered in its proper place.

I have heard so much of the good sense of Lord North, and particularly of his dexterity in extricating himself from the difficulties incident to his high station, that I must presume he is particularly attentive to the prudential measures of his predecessors, in the same department, and consequently to the conduct of the late Lord Orford on an occasion similar to this on the carpet.

When his Lordship, then Sir Robert Walpole, was solicited by the protestant dissenters to promote the repeal of the Test Act, so far as

related to them, he saw the righteousness and sound policy of the measure, with full conviction, and would have been led to it by his own disposition, could he have considered himself as unconnected with his *particular* service to government. He saw the expedience of strengthening the hands of the King and his real friends, by providing a balance against the malignity of papists and jacobites. But there was then an *Hybridous* faction on foot, in no small credit with the populace, the leaders of which professed themselves to be whigs in state matters, and tories in the concerns of the church. Among these was a large majority of the clergy. What their tenets were, may be learned from the pamphlets of those times, particularly from the treatise of the late Bishop Ellis, upon the subject of the test.* In contemplation of what he had to expect from that quarter, the Minister thus bespoke the *Petitioners* of that day.

" *Gentlemen*, you are too fast friends to his " Majesty and his Government, not to wish " his ministers may be as little incommoded as " possible by the seditious clamours and prac- " tices of those who *hate* both *you* and *us*. " The present disposition of the clergy, parti- " cularly those of this city, is sufficiently open " to your observation. It is as much as we can " do to get them to hold their tongues, by

* Intituled, *A Plea for the Sacramental Test, as a just security to the church established, and very conducive to the welfare of the State.* London, printed for I. Roberts near the Oxford Arms in Warwick Lane. 1736.

" soothing, humouring, and occasionally pre-
" ferring them, now that no umbrage is given
" them. What do you think would be the
" case, if by the repeal you solicit, we should
" open fifty mouths in fifty pulpits every Sun-
" day, against the King and his ministers,
" upon the pretence of their endeavouring to
" ruin the church ?"

I doubt not but Sir Robert had a copious list of reverend declaimers on this topic to exhibit, not more copious, however, than Lord North might procure at this period in a very few hours, from gentlemen well informed of the sense of the leading churchmen of the times. His Lordship, indeed, seems, by an expression hereafter to be noted, to be in possession of a more numerous catalogue than even Sir Robert himself. In the mean time, the *Rutherfordians*, the *Balguists*, the *Ibbetsonians*, the *Powellites*, the *Tuckerians*, the *Madanites*, the *Topladians*, &c. &c. &c. make up no despicable combination, not to mention my Lord of L——'s phalanx, who occupy the city pulpits as body guards in ordinary to the ruling system.

I do not believe that, if the prayer of the Petition had been granted, above half a dozen of these would have joined Mr. Romaine in his resolution, *never more to mount a pulpit;* and it may be easily conceived, what the weekly declamations of men so heated and irritated by disappointment, might have effected towards the downfal of those in power; who thus presumed to provoke, what Swift calls, the *Sacred Order.* It is well known what impressions the superstitious grimace of external

forms, and the enthusiasm of inward light make upon the vulgar, in their *separate* operations; what then must be their effect when their forces are *combined*, and pointed with vengeance at the devoted head of a minister?

Add to all this, that the question had been argued upon the foot of *civil* utility, not indeed originally by the Petitioners, who only followed whither their adversaries chose to lead them. The *Rotherams*, the *Balguys*, the *Forsters*, and the *Tuckers*, were the men, who, under the conduct of an eminent leader, brought crude politics into the dispute, and from their attachment to this topic, it might be concluded *a priori*, that it was too precious to be parted with, if statesmen and magistrates should disoblige them.

The ingenious gentleman, therefore, who brought to light this *Fortieth* article, should have set the saddle on the right horse, and have told the company who they were, who would have the first scruple to subscribe it. Not, surely, the Petitioners who would have obtained the relief, and whose principal view in seeking it, was to becalm this boisterous spirit of contention in their high church brethren, and whose success could not possibly have had worse consequences, with respect to diversities of opinion, than are already produced by the different judgments exhibited in the writings and preachings of those, who subscribe the *thirty-nine* articles without any scruple whatever.

For my own part, I have that opinion of the good sense and enlightened minds of many of

our present prelates, that I am obliged to believe, if there could have been any security given for the establishment of this *Fortieth* article, they would not have opposed the prayer of this Petition. Few of them indeed have given us any explicit opinion on the subject of it, and I draw my conclusion only from their pastoral admonitions, which, when their Lordships have thought proper to touch upon these late calls for reformation, have so far as I can learn, chiefly turned upon the tendency of *Innovations* to confusion and disorder.*

As the case has been stated above, it may perhaps be said, " that the influence of their " Lordships, whether in consequence of their " smiles or their frowns, would have check- " ed the zeal and insolence of such of their " subalterns as might be disposed to express " their discontents at the success of the Peti- " tioners." But their Lordships would have had the example of an *Hoadly* before their eyes, and perhaps of one or two survivors in their own body, whose lawn could not protect them from the strictures of their inferiors, the moment they left the beaten track of established system. The benefit of establishing this *fortieth* article *exclusively*, was well understood during the last pontifical reign. For this blessed purpose, the spiritual head of the church, condescended, as we are told, to become a *Reviewer*,† particularly of theological novelties, which he likewise took other sorts of pains

* See the Sermon before the Lords, *January* 30, 1772.

† See the Preface to *Junius's* Letters, published in octavo, 1771.

to strangle in the birth. Concerning which piece of ecclesiastical policy, it has been whispered, the booksellers of *London* and *Westminster* could, if they would, give us some curious anecdotes.*

I have remarked above, what pains have been taken to represent the petitioners as men of no principle, as men of the worst designs with respect both to church and state. †

It was well for these orators, that they were not called upon to support their accusations by competent proof before a legal tribunal. ‡

* Sometimes the secret transpired, *i. e.* when care was not taken to divide the *hush-money* properly. The late *Andrew Millar* had two or three entertaining stories on this subject. Neither was the moral Mr. *Richardson* unconscious of the practice.

† This is become the current language of the rostrum on many public, as well as common occasions, to the great relief of the poor methodists, who had been skinned from head to foot at Visitations, Ordinations, Assize-sermons, and other pulpit-exhibitions, particularly in the Universities. The petitioners are now taking their turn, and many a good dressing have they had by word of mouth and in print; insomuch, that being an humble hearer, I have often been reminded of the situation of Dr. *Vaughan*, bishop of London, who used to wish the tongues of certain preachers in his pocket while they entertained his lordship with invectives against the presbyterians, who, he said, were not to be converted by lies and railing. "It is true," added this worthy prelate, "they do not like the present form of "church government, and desire to have a different one: but this "they seek by petition, not by insurrection and sedition."

‡ The petitioners, according to Dr. David Durell, *prayed to be released from the bands by which society is united.* See *Monthly Review for August*, 1772. p. 121. An unwarrantable aspersion in every view, but more particularly as it stands without any specification, applicable to *all* society; which is going farther than the catholic ***** the free-thinking ******* or even the zealous Dean of *Gloucester* would venture. It is hoped these gentry may, by this time, have learned from the masterly letter to the worthy Sir *William Meredith*, on the subject of *subscription*, &c. printed for *Swan*, 1772.

In the mean time their insinuations were of infinite service to the good cause. Had the good people of England been suffered to persuade themselves, that the petitioners are men of serious piety, and unspotted probity, who had nothing in view but the liberty of regulating their instructions by the plain dictates of the *written word*, it must be confessed there were consequences in view not very edifying to those gentlemen, who are so much enamoured with *peace* and *quietness*.

One effect of peace and quietness is said to be, a very considerable increase of popery. For proofs and instances of this, we have been referred to every city and market town where there is a mass-house, and to the environs of the mansion of every Roman-catholic lord and gentleman in the kingdom.

Public peace hath likewise produced some other blessed effects, such as a multiplication of benevolent associations at *Ranelagh*, *Soho*, *Oxford road*, &c. &c. where however it has been said, the morals of many who attend them have acquired a taint, not very consistent with the *purity* of the religion they are supposed to

wherein the *bond of union* of a chriſtian and a proteſtant church, properly conſiſts. What is moſt extraordinary in this falſe and injurious repreſentation of this Oxford Doctor is, that he preſided at the trial, and pronounced ſentence of expulſion upon *Eraſmus Middleton*, and *Thomas Jones*, for attempting to tie theſe *bands of ſociety* a little tighter about the necks of this Doctor and his venerable aſſeſſors than they choſe to wear them. *See* Dr. *Nowell's* Anſwer to *Pietas Oxonienſis*, 2d. ed. p. 31, 32. But particularly *Pietas's* Remarks on this ſecond edition in a letter to Dr. *Nowell*, from p. 12, to p. 18, incluſive.

profess: and hints have been thrown out, that however the *peace of the public* might be undisturbed by these assemblies of good company, that of *private families* owes them nothing on that score.

It may be supposed, that to provide correctives for these *bagatelles*, would interrupt the important meditations of statesmen upon plans of government of ten times the consequence to the public; and it might be deemed great cruelty to break in upon the repose of a contemplative ecclesiastic, by recommending some particular notice of these deviations from the spirit of christianity, while the church is in no immediate danger from them. Thanks to heaven, there have been no *rebellions* since the year 1746, nor any *earthquakes* since the days of bishop Sherlock; and it seems to be a point of prudence and good husbandry, to reserve the powers of remonstrance till it shall please Providence to call for them by such manifest exhibitions of its displeasure.

I have met with both politicians and divines, who have said with a kind of sneering complacency, that it is quite sufficient to turn over the insolence of popery, and the licentiousness of protestants, to the correction of the methodists. But by the leave of these gentlemen, matters have taken a turn with respect to these zealots, which seem to have disqualified them for either of these provinces. A learned prelate of the establishment hath endeavoured to find out the complexion of popery, in the doctrines and practices of these pietists; and Mr. *Wesley*, as if he intended to support the bishop's compa-

rison, hath patronized a translation of the life of the Jesuit *Xavier*, as a proper manuel for the edification of his flock.

Another bishop, in the early days of methodism, characterised the leaders as *honest madmen, who spent all their fire against vice.** His lordship, however, understood in process of time, that they meddled with something else, and was put to the pains of writing a just volume to set the world right in the *doctrine of grace*, which had undergone, as he thought, some misrepresentations in the works of Mr. *Wesley* and others.

And indeed, whatever the fire of methodism against vice might be in the beginning, the furnace has burnt out all that sort of fuel long ago. The fire is now kept alive by the combustibles of a sort of controversy, where theo-

* It was by no means clear, even after an explanation of this judgment in a second edition of the D. L. in 1742, whether the author considered this *fire against vice*, as a mark of *honesty*, or a species of *madness* in the methodists. How far this matter may be illustrated by the following anecdote, is submitted to the reader's sagacity. In the year 1752 came out *Some observations on* TACITUS by *T. Hunter*, vicar of *Garstang*. &c. In this work there was, among other reprehensible matter, an abusive character of bishop *Burnet*, to the account of whose offences was placed in the foremost class, his *intemperate rage against vice*. In the same volume occurred, an Elogy of the author of the D. L. then ripening into that *fame*, which afterwards elevated him to a prime dignity in the church. It is said, that a letter of compliment was sent to the vicar, on this happy exhibition of his critical talents, (purchased perhaps by his polite panegyric) wherein he was felicitated, as *the first who had hit upon bishop* Burnet's *true character*; in which, as the vicar gave it, *honesty* was no remarkable ingredient; and an *intemperate rage* against *any thing*, may well enough pass for a species of *infanity*.

logical dogmata make the blaze, with little or no supply from the *practical licentiousness* of the times; not to mention the affairs the methodists have now with the petitioners, and the necessity of lending their shoulders to support the articles, in agreement with their old friends Dr. *Nowell*, Dr. *Randolph*, and other Doctors, whose charges, sermons, and publications, would not justify their accepting the aid of such fellow-labourers, but in the present case of *extreme distress*.

Admitting the petitioners to be men of sense and conscience, and as such, anxious for the security of the protestant religion, it is hardly to be doubted, but they are desirous to prevent the fatal consequences of an increase of papists, both to church and state. It should seem to be no light matter to English protestants in *any* station, that his Majesty's subjects are so frequently led astray from their allegiance to their lawful sovereign, and taught to transfer it to the bishop of *Rome*. On the other hand, a protestant pastor or teacher, cannot well be unconcerned, that so many of his flock should be misled by the artful emissaries of *Rome*, from the rock of their salvation, to the impiety of an idolatrous worship, and the bondage of a superstition, which rests solely on a blasphemous usurpation of divine powers incommunicable to frail and fallible man. Hence I conjecture the petitioners, if released from the bond of their present subscription, would exert themselves in opposition to this capital corruption, and vigorously attack popery *a fundamentis*.

But here I expect to be told, that their objections to the *thirty-nine articles*, so many of which are express in condemning the errors of popery, is no sign of their zeal to suppress it, but rather of a contrary disposition, as some of their adversaries have been charitable enough to insinuate.

But be pleased to observe, I say *a fundamentis;* and I doubt not but many of the petitioners think as I do, that it is in vain to renounce the particular doctrines of popery, while they are obliged to assent, that, *the church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith.* If it may be proved, that the church of *England* hath this authority, it will be impossible to prove, that the church of *Rome* hath it *not;* and to what purpose is it to condemn those *fond things* to-day, which may be established by the authority of the church to-morrow?*

The nugatory and equivocal restriction in the subsequent part of the *twentieth* article, will not help at all to reconcile this authority to the constitution of a genuine protestant church.

Allow the church to be *witness and keeper of holy writ*, exclusive of all *other* witnesses and keepers, and she will be under no difficulty, in case of controversies, in *witnessing* and *keeping her own* sense of scripture, so as to stand

* It was probably on this consideration, that the late Dr. *Rundle* subscribed the *Irish* articles of religion, only *so far forth as they are opposite to popery*, as appears by the Primate of *Ireland's* Register, a copy of which was, some years ago, in the hands of a worthy prelate of the church of England.

clear of all *repugnancy* whatever. She will witness her own interpretations, and none others, to be true, and ascertain them by her supposed authority, to be the rule for all her members; and to be satisfied, that the church of England is not freer from this presumption than any other church, the inquisitive reader may examine those texts of scripture, which *Rogers*, an authorised interpreter of the *thirty-nine* articles, brings to prove the several propositions into which he analyses them.*

Father *Sinclair*, in his *Paraphrastic Exposition*, of this *twentieth* article, fetches his interpretation of this latter part of it (concerning the first part he hath not the least objection to the *literal* sense) from St. *Austin*, who says, "Because the holy scripture cannot possibly "deceive, whosoever is afraid of being deceived, let him consult the church, which the "scripture points out to him without any ambiguity" Apply this to the church of *England*, and the alternative will be this. If the church of *England* is thus pointed out as an interpreter of scripture, without ambiguity, the church of *England* must be infallible; if otherwise, she hath but an *ambiguous* right to the authority she claims, and they who apply to

* Rogers exhibits the *fourth* propoſition of the *twentieth* article, thus. "The church hath power to interpret and expound the word "of God." And for proof of it, brings *Matt.* xi. 27. *No man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him.* What light this text of ſcripture gives to the propoſition, would reqüire the learning and authority of a whole convocation to explain. Nor do his ſubſequent proofs from ſcripture make us at all wiſer

her for the true sense of scripture, may be deceived.

I cannot indeed conceive in what way the *public peace* of the *state* would be affected, should the petitioners, and others, be let loose to expose the *fundamental* errors of popery to his Majesty's loyal subjects, in their full deformity; unless there is some secret *alliance*, of which we are not aware, stipulating, that the papists should be soothed and indulged in their *political*, as well as their *ecclesiastical* opinions, and set upon a level with his Majesty's sworn lieges in every article of civil privilege. I trust they are not yet strong enough, either in numbers, or in property, to contest their claims with the present government in a military way; and I cannot devise what infringement of the *public peace* would follow from the endeavours of a protestant clergy to prevent their growing any stronger.

But let us not be too presuming. *Public peace*, in the idea of the gentleman who would make a doctrinal point of it in a *fortieth* article, may be relative to connections, contracts, securities, and reciprocations, of which mere spectators of the visible movements of the grand machine, can know nothing.

But the odds against public peace, I suspect, may be more observable to a common eye, with respect to the other object of a conscientious clergyman's opposition, *viz.* the *vicious dissipation* of *the times.*

Public dissipation is patronized by men of titles and emblems of great dignity among the laity, who may give a sanction to what they

please; and it hath been insinuated, that the *alliance* takes place even in this department, and that clerks with *honourable distinctions*, have rendered these parties quite canonical by their presence and conformity, that they might not seem to be disaffected to the *public peace*, by the least shew of renitency to such employment.

The methodists, if they were disposed to display their talents once more against the licentiousness of the great and small vulgar, would have little chance to be heard Their zeal is uncharitable, and their sentences of condemnation outrageous. Not to mention, that till this execrable petition turned the fire-edge of the orthodox another way, our pulpits echoed with the most furious invectives against their heresies, delusions, and insanity; and they had been now absolutely out of credit, if one of these chemical occasions, which combines the most jarring elements, had not come upon the *church militant*, and obliged her to take in these pietists as associates in their opposition to the *antisubscriptionists*, on a compact, we may suppose, that while the church connives at their *calvinistical* divinity, the methodists shall be equally tender of affronting *arminian* morality.* The public peace, therefore, runs no risque from this quarter.

* Why else are Meſſieurs *Bowman*, *Toplady*, &c. ſilent on Dr. *Tucker's* two letters to Dr. *Kippis*? Is it a ſmall matter in their account, to have *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, and other compilers of the thirty-nine articles, dragged *vi et armis*, to the Arminian camp, and made to ſpeak what the Dean of Gloceſter ſhall think proper to dictate?

It is very possible, however, that sensible men, who search the scriptures with sobriety, and observe the shocking contrariety of our public manners to the dictates of christianity, might have some little influence towards awakening numbers of thoughtless mortals to a sense of their christian obligations. Their personal estimation, the strength of their reasonings, and the consistency of their practical deportment, would of course recommend and give weight to their remonstrances, and might convince numbers, how irreconcileable a course of profligate dissipation is with the hope of eternal life in the world to come.

You will ask, what hinders them from making such remonstrances *now ?*—I will answer your question. They *may* make them, and probably *do* make them *now*; but while they lie under suspicions of subscribing doctrines to which they cannot heartily and sincerely assent, their hearers will think they have a right to conclude, that they are no more in earnest in the *one* case than in the *other*.

It is true, the *thirty-nine articles* say nothing for or against *Ranelaghs, Routs, Pantheons*, &c. &c. and a preacher may, consistently enough with his subscription, hold forth the secret and open iniquities of these, without forfeiting the reputation of an honest man.

But then here is another misfortune. While the *thirty nine* articles stand, as they do by

As for *Pietas Oxonienfis*, he indeed may plead, that Dr. *Tucker* hath done little more than pillage Dr. *Nowell*, to whom he hath sufficiently applied little David's fling.

the privilege of *an establishment*, upon a level with the scriptures, and ready, upon some occasions, even to take place of them, * the parties concerned to be instructed will conclude, that whatever is not contradicted in the established rule of faith and duty, must be *lawful*. In which conceit it is well if they are not supported by the orations of those of their teachers, who have no idea of qualms on account of subscription.

"Some well-timed political panegyric," says a shrewd writer, "or some hackneyed essay "on a branch of *moral duty*, glittering with "antithesis, and rounded into sentences of "harmonious cadences, now and then seasoned "with some small comic raillery, or slight "strokes of tragic address, compose the greater "part of our modern boasted pulpit perfor-"mances."†

* Whatsoever *confirms* a testimony, is commonly reputed to be of greater authority than the testimony itself. "These testimonies," says the *Piety* of *Goliath Slain*, "of the word of God concerning "the entire depravity which over-spread the whole world upon the "sin of Adam, is abundantly confirmed by our own church." p. 139. After which, he appeals to certain *articles*, *collects*, &c. a sort of *confirmation* much more suitable to the words of *Goliath's* Gods, than to the word of the God of little *David*. But, to be fair and honest, this kind of *piety* is not peculiar to the methodists.

† See a Pamphlet intituled, *A Defence of Strictures on* Dr. Lowth, *respecting liberty, with observations on other men and things*: *Flexney*, 1767. This writer is not the only one who is disgusted with the sermons in vogue. A critic under the patronage of Mr. R. Baldwin is of opinion, that, "setting aside the occasional "raptures which are interspersed through the late Mr. *Whitefield's* "sermons, there is more *simple piety*, more *salutary doctrine*, and "more *important truths* in *one* of them, than in half the *lectures* "which our present *refined*, *philosophical*, *flimsy*, *lisping*, *water-*

This is bad enough, but it is worse when our modern *pulpit critics* undertake the province of, what they please to call, *explaining scripture;* that is to say, of accommodating the most important precepts in the New Testament to the modes of the times, the taste of their patrons, and even to the several corruptions in our religious establishment, which custom has sanctified, interested churchmen indiscriminately and pertinaciously defend, and which the connivance of civil government will probably suffer to proceed to that deplorable *crisis*, when the state will *really* "have more "*political need* of the church, than the church "will have of the state;"—a most insolent insinuation, for which a truly patriotic senate would have unfrocked the author, without troubling the convocation with the discussion of his theological principles.*

"*gruel* clergymen ever preached, or ever will preach." London Magazine for Auguſt, 1772, p. 388; which may be true, and no great compliment to Mr. Whitefield.

* So far as this Thraſonic doctrine of the *Alliance* is only *ridiculous*, it is moſt happily expoſed by the late maſterly *Frederick Toll*, in his *Letter to the* R. R. Dr. WARBURTON, Biſhop of Glouceſter, *viz.* "The moſt efficacious doctrine of religion, is the "doctrine of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments. The civil "magiſtrate believes it, is willing to make uſe of it for the good of "his ſubjects. *No, hold*, cries the church, *hands off, if you "pleaſe; you are not to meddle with it, this is part of my for-"tune, and I am determined not to marry; and without a mar-"riage, you can have nothing to do with it.*—Say you ſo? "*Says the civil magiſtrate*, let me whiſper a word in your ear;—"Continue coy as long as you like it; we ſhall ſoon ſee who will "be able to ſhift beſt in an unmarried ſtate, you or myſelf. As to the "fortune you talk of, and claim for your own, I have as good a "right to it as you have, the right of poſſeſſion; and you may de-

If we should be thought to ask more than it is reasonable to grant *viz.* that the preaching of this loose morality hath arisen from a certain habit of explaining away the genuine sense of the articles, I shall only say, that this indulgence, granted to public dissipation, was not the *pulpit fashion*, when it plainly appeared that the clergy *believed* what they subscribed, and took no common pains to make every body else believe it too. Nor indeed is it at all an unnatural supposition, that they whose casuistry upon the articles has been so successful as to turn them to the support of *arminianism*, should be inclined, where the occasion called for it, to try the experiment upon the scriptures, and give the rigid precept a more courteous aspect towards the *manners* of the *Epicurean*.

I will venture then to conclude from these premises, that if serious, learned, and conscientious men, were set at liberty to deliver the plain document of the scriptures without disguise, and without the apprehension of being reproached for contravening their previous engagements to the established doctrine of the church, we should hear much oftener from the pulpit, of the consequences, both present and future, of our popular corruptions, to the edification, perhaps the conversion of numbers, who, for want of such instruction, may be in the very *gall of bitterness*, and *the bond of iniquity*.

" bar me the application of it if you can." p. 40. This excellent letter was printed for Shuckburgh, 1760.

I am apt to believe too, that the rising generation of the clergy, by setting out upon a firmer and less variable foundation than their predecessors, would furnish the public with an increase of conscientious pastors, who not being incumbered either with the *prejudices*, the *cautious timidity*, or the *courtly delicacy*, of modern expectants, would exert themselves with freedom and spirit in the cause of their religion and country, and endeavour at least to rescue them both from the *politicàl* as well as the *evangelical* WO denounced upon those *who call evil good*, and *good evil*.

And indeed, who could answer for the *public peace* upon such an event? If we are to believe a sort of observers, who sometimes drop hints for our admonition, it is a maxim of modern policy to amuse the common sense and the powers of reflection of a high spirited people, with every kind of idle diversion, accompanied with an indulgence of every sensual appetite, to prevent their prying into the principle and tendency of the current state manœuvres, and to habituate them to a luxurious effeminacy and indolence, destructive of that understanding, courage, and strength, which might rouse them to an active vigilance over their liberties, and a spirited opposition to the invaders of them. This is an expedient strongly recommended by expert politicians,* and

* Tyrannus viros graves et juſtos odio proſequitur. ſuſpectoſque habet, ac ne qui tales evadant, omni arte curat. Quia vero non prius ſe tutum putat, quam omnium mores corruperit, Popinas, Ganeas, Lupanaria, Ludos, ut Cyrus domandis Sardis, inſtituit. *Vind.*

has been so often found to have its effects towards keeping the *public peace*, that it is yet, we may well suppose, among the first *elements* in the grammar of every able politican.

Upon a prospect therefore of turning our divinity into another channel, (a prospect to which they who examine the terms of the petition cannot be wholly blind) the patrons of, and associates in the *amusements* in vogue, cannot be without their apprehensions of a melancholy reverse of their present *peace* and *quiet*. They will naturally reflect, how narrowly the *public peace* had escaped the claws of Sir John, in a late attempt upon poor Mrs. Cornelys, and how likely it was at that crisis, that *the letter of the law* would be a match for a strong exertion of patrician influence; a case indeed which has not lately often happened, and may not suddenly happen again; but is, however, a sufficient warning to beware, that the *public peace* may not run the like risque from *the letter of the gospel*.

This, I apprehend, is one laudable view of proposing this *fortieth* article, which being established for subscription, and the interpretation left to the *heads* of the *alliance*; father Philips, and the long Baronet, may, together with their respective associates, sit quietly down to their dinners.

This, you will say, may do for the *state*, as long at least as such temporary expedients are

Cond. Tyr. Q. iii. Plerique rerum potentus perverse consulent, et eŏ se munitiores putant, quo illi quibus imperitant, nequiores fuêre.
Salluſt. De Rep. Ord.

wont to last. But the grand question is, whether this single article would do for the peace of the *church*, without the addition of the other *thirty-nine ?* For it is to be understood, that the church, in making *her* bargains, is a little more provident than the state; and in the word *peace*, includes the ideas of *prosperity* and *affluence;* whereas the *plenipotentiaries* of the *state*, provided they are not incommoded by opposition in their own particular departmant, fare extremely well, whatever little distresses the inferior members of the *state* may have to complain of.

This then is the point we have to debate with the learned and ingenious Dr. Josiah Tucker, the present Dean of Glocester, who very modestly desires but two *postulata* whereon to erect a demonstration, that the church of England must be absolutely ruined, if this petition should meet with success.

Undoubtedly it was in the power of Dr. Tucker's correspondent, to grant him whatever he chose to demand. It is a point of friendship to indulge an old acquaintance in some small reveries, which other people may think a little unreasonable. But as the correspondent has not told us his mind upon this subject, it is possible he may be as firmly persuaded of the *evil tendency* of the Dean's principles, as the Dean pretends to be of his. Nor should I be much surprised to find, that is really the case.

The first of these two *postulata* is thus worded. " All societies must have some *common* " *centre* of *union*, and be governed by some

" rule, either *expressed* or *implied*, either *writ-*
" *ten* or *traditionary*."

It is very rare to find a general proposition advanced by an adroit writer of controversy, which is free from ambiguous or equivocal terms. What is here meant by *a common centre of union?* Does it stand for the *ultimate end*, for which *all* societies are formed, or does it mean the *bond of union*, or the *specific compact*, by which the several members of particular societies, are attached to their respective bodies? Or is it the same thing with the *rule* by which societies are governed?—Perhaps the Dean's second postulatum may clear up this matter, *viz.*

" Those persons who are admitted members
" of *such* societies, and more especially those
" who propose themselves to be candidates for
" *offices* and *honourable distinctions* in the same,
" are to be supposed to approve of this rule *in*
" *the main*, and this *centre of union, whatever*
" *it may happen to be.*"

No.—We are driven to our conjectures again: what does the Dean mean by *such* societies? He cannot mean *such* societies, as *all* societies, for *all* societies have not these *honourable distinctions* to bestow, nor are *offices* and *honourable distinctions*, the *ultimate end*, or the *specific bond of union*, or the *rule of government* in *all* societies.

To explain this mystery then, we must go back to the Dean's title-page, and there we find, that he is writing, *An Apology for the present church of* England, *as by law established.*

Things begin now to brighten up. We are to understand, that the present church of *England, as by law established,* is one of the *such* societies here intended, that the church of *England,* not as consisting of *pastors and people,* but as wholly composed of *clerks,* or *clerical persons,* whose *common centre of union,* considered as the *ultimate end* of her incorporation, are *offices* and *honourable distinctions,* and whose *common centre of union,* considered as the *specific compact* upon which admittance is to be gained into the society, is *subscription* to the *thirty-nine* articles of religion.

In *such* society, the lay part of the people, as such, have neither part nor lot. They are not admitted to be candidates for *offices* or *honourable distinctions* in it, nor are they required to approve of the *common centre of union* of *such* society, by their subscription.

Now this, I apprehend, the petitioners will think a very unreasonable *postulatum.* They will be apt to say, that the account the Dean gives here of *his* church of England, is very different from the account that their church of England gives of herself.

The Dean's forecast in keeping *his* particular society out of sight as long as he could, was not *needless.* He might have been asked *prematurely,* whether the rule by which this his *such* society is governed, is *expressed* or *implied, written* or *traditionary.* Much may depend upon these circumstances. A rule adopted by way of *implication,* may be founded in a wicked

combination of interested interpreters. A rule adopted from *tradition*, might originate in the whim of some crazy bigot, or dreaming visionary in the midnight of monkery. It behoved the Dean however, to be explicit on this head, at his setting out, the rather, as the church of *England*, with which the petitioners pretend to be concerned, gives, as I said, a very different account of herself, *viz.*

"The visible church of Christ, is a congre-
"gation of faithful men, in the which, the
"*pure word of God* is preached, and the sacra-
"ments be duly administred, in all those things
"that of necessity are requisite to the same."

In this definition, the laity are comprehended as well as the clergy. If, with respect to such a congregation, the abstract term, *a centre of union*, has any meaning, it must have immediate relation to this *preaching of the pure word of God*, and the *due administration of the sacraments*, and in these the laity have an important interest. It is in these *fundamentals*, that the present *church of* England, *as by law established*, grounds her claim of being *a visible church of Christ;* and whatever the society which excludes them may be besides, it can have no title to *that* denomination.

A morose logician might therefore say, that the Dean, in his second *postulatum*, begs the very thing in question between him and the petitioners. But I am of opinion, his reverence may, with a little management, save his *postulatum* and his *orthodoxy* too, by the limiting words, *in the main*. He approves the *centre*

of union of the church of England *in the main*, but reserves to himself the liberty of dissenting from the first paragraph of this *nineteenth* article, as it takes in *incompetent* and *unqualified* members, and refers to *a rule of government*, wherein no mention is made of those *honourable distinctions.*

Some have imagined, that the worthy Dean, misled by his meditations on *trade*, had conceived, that the *centre of union* in the church of England, might be similar to the *centre of union* in the *East-India company;* and that full of that idea, he had overlooked the claim of the church, to be *a visible church of Christ* under the direction of *the pure word of God.*

I own I am not of that opinion. I am persuaded he was well aware of that circumstance; and knowing that others had gone before him in this warfare, who had made concessions at their entrance, which had set them fast in their progress, he was determined to avoid that inconvenience at all events.

The late *Regius-professor* of divinity in the University of *Cambridge*, had as much occasion for an *analogical* similitude between the church of England, and *all* or *any* other societies, as the Dean of *Glocester*. But unfortunately he was too late with his *postulatum.* He had unwarily granted, that the church he was *vindicating*, is "a society instituted by Christ "himself, of which Christ is the head; and that "this church included in it *all those* who pro-"fess to believe in his name, and have been

"received by baptism into the number of his "disciples." The learned professor had moreover admitted, "the end and purpose for which "*this* society was instituted, to be, to lead "men to eternal life by the preservation and "advancement of true religion."

Now it is very evident, that *this* society cannot be *such* society as *all* societies, or as *any other* society, either in its *centre of union*, (whatever the Dean may mean by that vague and equivocal term) or in its *rule of government*. Accordingly when the professor came to take refuge in the analogy *this* society bore to all other societies, he found the door was shut against him, and, to give him his due praise, he was too honest to force it open by expedients, which his own principles forbad him to apply.*

The Dean, I think, could hardly avoid seeing, that to hazard such a concession, might lose him all the advantages against the petitioners, which he proposed to himself, in drawing his conclusions.

* *Melanchon*, in his epiſtle to *Oecolampadius*, giving an account of *Luther's* diſpute with *Eccius* at *Leipſic*, anno. 1519, diſcovers the reſpectable origin of the notion, that the church is *like all other ſocieties*.—Agi cæptum eſt de Romani Pontificis autoritate, controverſumque eſt, *an jure divino probari poſſet oecumenici Pontificis autoritas?* Eſſe oecumenicum Pontificem, ingenue fatetur *Lutherus*. In hoc diſputat: *An jure divino probari ejus autoritas poſſit*. In hunc locum, quandoquidem paulo aſperior eſt, dies quinque, ni fallor, impenſi ſunt. *Ibi multa acerbe* Eccius, *multa inciviliter, breviter omnio ejuſmodi, ut invidiam apud vulgus* Luthero *conflaret*. Argumentum primum erat Eccii, *Eccleſiam* ακεφαλον *eſſe non poſſe, cum* civile corpus *ſit; eſſe igitur papam jure divino caput Eccleſiæ*. Tum Lutherus, CHRISTUM *ſe fateri caput eſſe, cum Eccleſia ſit* regnum ſpiritus, *non deſiderare aliud Caput, ut ad*

But you will say, why might he not have grounded his *postulatum* on the system of *alliance*, projected some years ago by an *honourably distinguished* personage, to whom the Dean owes an especial respect on account of his particular situation?

I will tell you why. That system had allowed a *saving* of certain privileges to the church of Christ, which, when they came to be examined, made it questionable whether the governors of a christian church, had any powers delegated by Christ to enter into such *alliance?* In discussing this question, it appeared, that the written word was silent concerning such powers. In claiming them therefore as *official* powers, the claimants ran the hazard of passing for *usurpers*. In claiming them as the grants of the people, they might be deemed *impostors*, the people having confessedly no such powers to grant.

This scheme of *alliance* then, would answer the Dean's purpose, as little as Dr. *Rutherforth's* method of vindication. And as to the article of *due respect*, experience has shewn, that, however the leaders of the *clerical society* may agree *in the main centre of union*, in defence of *offices*, *honourable distinctions*, and the appurtenances thereof, they have not always

Col. i. 18. GERDESIUS. Hiſtor. Renovat. Relig. Vol. I. Append. p. 206. And *Melch. Adam.* LUTHER. p. 111. The reader may poſſibly perceive from this citation, not only whence Dr. *Tucker's* palmary argument againſt the petitioners is borrowed, but likewiſe how venerable a precedent he may alledge for the *invidious* inſinuations with which his pamphlet abounds.

any greater deference for each others theological opinions, than for those of the petitioners.*

Dr. *Tucker*, accordingly, to avoid the mistakes of his predecessors, contrives a society purely *clerical*, with which the laity have no right to interfere, not even with the magistrate at their head, (except perhaps in certain cases where *de facto* the magistrate has *honourable distinctions* to bestow.) And this being granted as a *postulatum*, the consequence flows of itself, without the pains of a formal deduction, *viz.* To admit those into *such* society, who do not approve of the *centre of union*, *whatever it may happen to be*, and *rule of government*, at least *in the main*, would be to overturn the society from its very foundation.

That the Dean's *such* society, for which he apologises, is a merely *clerical* one, exclusive of any *lay-members*, will still more plainly appear from what his reverence immediately *infers*.

"From both which postulata," says our ingenious apologist, "I am *led to infer*, that the "more important the ends and uses of any so-"ciety are supposed to be, the sooner, gene-

* Something of this sort is whispered to have happened on occasion of this very *Apology*. The Apologist's superiors had no objection to his securing to them their lucrative emoluments, and honourable distinctions in his two *postulata*. But when he proceeded to plead for the exemption of dissenters and young academics from the obligation to subscribe the thirty-nine articles, he found that the imposing subscription according to the established modes indiscriminately, was *an honourable distinction* which his commanding officers did not chuse to part with; nor was it any advantage to the Dean's estimation with his clerical superiors, that, upon occasion of the debate on the dissenters' bill, he had the honour to be quoted in P——t.

" rally speaking, will such an institution ar-
" rive at acquisitions of *temporal possessions.*"

But why; *any* society? Is the Dean apologising for *any* society but *one?* And why not, *such* society, the term in his *postulatum?* We have it indeed in the end of the inference, *such an institution;*—that is to say, such an institution as the *such* society meant in the two *postulata;* which we now find to be the church of England, as by law established.

Now, to whom do these temporal possessions belong, when they *are* acquired? Evidently to the clergy as such, and exclusive of every layman in the kingdom as such, none of whom, excepting a few of their own servants, are allowed to bear any of the offices, partake of any of the *honourable distinctions* mentioned in the *postulatum*, or touch a penny-worth of the temporal possessions thus acquired, nor consequently obliged (which indeed is but equitable) to approve by subscription, *the centre of union*, which holds this mysterious society together.

The reader undoubtedly will think with me, that a society so privileged, distinguished, and endowed, should have some very important ends and uses indeed. A consideration which will lead us to contemplate a little the origin of this importance, and of these advantages *exclusively* appropriated to it. The Dean can have no objection to an inquiry, which is so naturally suggested by his own *inference.*

Generally speaking (to borrow a little of the Dean's prudential caution) when the *clerical society first* acquired these temporal possessions, the members of it were supposed to have among

them, a complete power of opening heaven or hell at their pleasure. They pretended to carry the keys at their girdles, and to let in or shut out whomsoever they thought good. The *ostensible* importance, ends, and uses of this institution, consisted in the *exercise of this power;* the *real* importance, ends, and uses of it, were *dominion over the consciences*, and by that means, *free access to the purses* of the poor deluded people.

" Divers persons," says the Dean, " either " in their life time, or at their decease, WILL " think it expedient out of a principle of zeal, " of emulation, or *perhaps* from *less laudable* " motives, to subscribe sums of money, or to " give lands, or leave legacies for the support " and encouragement of such an important " institution."

It is a pretty long stride to pass from the times when this *such* institution *soonest arrived at the acquisition* of these temporal possessions, to the present age. And supposing the *importance* of this *such institution* to have been the same from the days of *Constantine*, it will be no pleasing contemplation to a lover of his country, that this important institution is still arriving at farther acquisitions of temporal possessions, by the weakness of divers persons who *will* think it expedient to support and encourage it.

Could the Dean hope, in a period which affords so many writers and readers of history, to cover his march, by throwing a veil over a course of twelve or fifteen hundred years? The honest truth is, that all this *zeal* and *emulation*

for at least two-thirds of the time, has been, without a *perhaps*, a frank merchandise, so much *salvation*, for so much *money*. The superstitious devotee stipulated so many *masses, obiits, requiems*, so many years of *indulgence* or *refrigeration*, for such a sum of money, or so many acres of land, as the covenanting parties could agree for. Where the more laudable motive, *superstition*, (called here, politely enough, *zeal* and *emulation*) did not rise to a sufficient height, or where the purchaser was a little hard-fisted, in driving the bargain, some *useful* and *important* member of the society was employed to procure *visions*, *miracles*, *ghosts*, and other sceuical exhibitions, to terrify the wavering patient into the necessity of opening his purse, or sealing the parchment.

Some of these *less laudable motives*; are still upon record. "It happened," says Father "*Paul*, when first the church was allowed to "acquire real estates, that some religious per- "sons entertaining an opinion, that it was a "service to God, to disinherit the children "and heirs of families, in order to give their "estates to the church, omitted no artifice "to persuade widows, maids, and other easy "people, ready to receive any impressions, to "deprive their own families, and make the "church their heirs. And this distemper "grew to such a height, that the Prince was "obliged to provide against it.——*Charle* "*maign* made a law to forbid churches to re- "ceive any gifts which disinherit children or "kindred."*

* On Eccles. Benefices, *chap.* vi.

It was not however this, or twenty such laws, that could put a stop to these *less laudable methods* of providing *temporal possessions* for the *clerical society*; and Dean *Tucker* frankly acknowledges it is not *yet*.

" Nor," says he, " is it in the power of the " civil magistrate, even where he disapproves " of these benefactions, totally to prevent " them." Which, I apprehend, is nearly the same thing as to exclude the civil magistrate from any concern with the clerical society. Against his intermeddling in matters merely *spiritual*, the society is sufficiently guarded. Take away his power of controlling or regulating their temporal acquisitions, and he is completely ousted of all authority with respect to this sacred order. Is not this fairly to confess, that superstition, and the knavery and avarice by which it is encouraged and supported, will, in *every age*, be too hard for the wisest and most righteous ordinances of civil government? It had been indeed to no purpose to dissemble it, after the repeated experience we have had of the dexterity of the *clerical society* in evading the several *Mortmain* laws enacted to restrain them in the use of these less laudable motives.*

It would however be neither just nor candid to deny, that the church considered in a less exceptionable light acquired many temporal possessions (as many perhaps as would have supplied all the real necessities, and have answered all the real *importance* of a truly christian church) in a *more reputable* way, and

* See Chambers's Dict. under the word *Mortmain*.

upon *more laudable* motives : but I must make this a *postulatum* in my turn ; for in my present penury of records, I cannot prove it without sending the reader to Dr. Newton's *Pluralities indefensible;* and there are many respectable men among Dean *Tucker's* clients, whom I would not willingly offend.

With the Dean himself I shall not stand upon the like ceremony; as I cannot, in any reason, grant him his second postulatum while it is loaded with those *honourable distinctions*, which seem to him to be so especial a portion of the church for which he is apologising.

I am therefore under a necessity of exhibiting another quotation from Father *Paul*, on which Dr. *Newton* seems to have laid some stress.

" Ecclesiastical degrees were not established
" ed *at their institution*, on the foot of dig-
" nities, pre-eminences, recompenses, or ho-
" nours, as they are at this day, and have
" been for many ages, but upon that of *mi-*
" *nistries* and *offices*; to which St. Paul gives
" the name of *Labours*, in the same sense as
" Jesus Christ hath called those who were
" therewith invested, *Labourers.* They who
" were appointed to the offices, were obliged
" to discharge them in their own persons ;
" nor, absenting themselves from them, could
" with justice, retain either the title or the
" profits of them. It is but since the year
" *seven hundred*, that in the *Western* church,
" ecclesiastical ministries changed their na-
" ture, and became degrees of dignity and

" honour, and were bestowed as recompenses " of services."*

Now if the *offices* themselves stood upon this footing *before* the year *seven hundred*, and if making the *labour* inseparable from the *office*, was derived from the sense of *Jesus Christ* and St. *Paul*, whose authority the church of England herself acknowledges to be superior to that of the *Western* church, I should think that something of the *labour*, as well as of the *office* and *honourable distinction*, might be admitted into the Dean's *centre of union*, whatever it means. Candidates indeed for laborious offices, with no rewards or distinctions either in hand, or in prospect, but such as bore a just proportion to the labour, would not, I fear, be very numerous; a circumstance which might probably contract the *circumference* of the union, whatever should become of the *centre* of it.

But perhaps some blundering copyist, or designing translator, might have played some tricks with that copy of the record from which Father *Paul* collected the sense of Jesus and his Apostle; and in that case, this *fallibility in the descent*, would make it of little authority, and this being shewn by the Dean to be the case, I do not see why his reverence might not turn his *inference* into a *third postulatum;* as thus:

" *Such* society must have a right, arising from the important ends and uses of its insti-

* Newton, p. 71, from *Hist. Conc. Trid.* b. ii. p. 203, of *Brent's* translation, 1676; where the passage is in much stronger terms, than in *Courayer's* which *Newton* cites.

" tution, to acquire temporal possessions, by " every possible means, and to retain and ap- " propriate them to such services as may best " answer the interests and purposes of *such* " society, without any regard to the rules of " civil justice, or permitting the magistrate to " interfere either with the acquisition or the " distribution of them." And then the way would be completely levelled for the introduction of the Dean's conclusion. viz. " Therefore " *such* society might form such *centre of* " *nnion*, and establish such *rules of govern-* " *ment*, and such *conditions* of *admission*, as " their discretion should find requisite.

But, after all, I am apprehensive, that the petitioners may object to the Dean's whole system, and say, " What is all this to us ? We " do not admit this picture to be a faithful re- " semblance of that church of England of " which we are members, even as it is by law " established. If the law has established this " *exclusive clerical society*, under the name of " the church of *England*, it is more than we " know, and what. for the honour of the law " as well as the church, we are unwilling to " suppose.

" We acknowledge," might they say, " that " there have been men, even from the early " days of the Protestant church of *England*, " who have endeavoured to turn her into a " *mere clerical society*, and who, by a coinci- " dence of favourable circumstances, may " have so far succeeded in the attempt, as to " procure some laws for her discipline and go- " vernment, not very consistent with her sub-

" jection to the laws of Christ. But thanks " be to God, they have not so far prevailed " as to suppress the church of England's *tes-* " *timony of herself*, that she is *a visible church* " *of Christ*, and under the controul of his " *written word.* And as *this testimony* is as " firmly established by law, as any other cir- " cumstance of her constitution, and is the " original ground work of her reformation " from popery, every thing contrary to it, " however established by human authority, " must be considered as a *corruption* of the " very same nature as those popish assuments " whose obstruction to the *free course of the* " *word of God*, not only gave occasion, but " afforded a complete justification of the " church of *England* in separating from the " church of *Rome.* Of these corruptions, and " of these only, we desire a reformation of " the legislature. And whoever, like the an- " gry Dean of *Glocester*, affirms, that the " church of *England* would be ruined by such " reformation, must unavoidably be driven, " first or last, to acknowledge, that the " church of *England*, is not *a visible church* " *of Christ ;* it being impossible that the *pure* " *word of God* should be preached, where the " doctrines and commandments of men are in- " termixed with it, and stand, by the means of " what is called an *establishment*, on the same " level with it."*

* " Piety," said that eminent formalist Archbishop *Secker*, " is " indeed seated in the heart ; but to give it no vent in outward ex- " pression, is to stifle and extinguish it. Neglecting the public ex-

Many readers of Dean *Tucker's* pamphlet, considering the cogency of this plea, and the perspicuity of the argument on which it is founded, have supposed, that the Dean, having turned his thoughts so incessantly to secular commerce, had mistaken the question, and applied his Apology to a wrong object, *viz.* the *temporal emoluments*, instead of the *evangelical privileges* of the church of *England.*

I will not say but this might be the case in part. but undoubtedly, *in the main*, he was well aware of this plea of the petitioners, and accordingly addresses himself to answer it, and having gone on with great fluency, till he found this block of the scriptures in his passage, he looks about him for a way to escape, and finding no opening to the right hand or the left,

" ercise of religion, is destroying the public regard to it, and teaching " men to despise their own form of religion, is enough, very often, " to make them despise it under any form." *Charge.* 1738. St. Paul however seems to have been of a different opinion when he spake of *groanings which could not be uttered.* ROM. viii. 26. which he seems to have taken for the groanings of a *pious* heart. But to let that pass. By *religion*, I would hope, his Grace meant revealed religion as we have it in the scriptures. But surely a man may be taught to despise *his own form of religion*, (that is to say, as his Grace words it, the form by which he publicly exercises *his* religion) as contrary to the end and design, as well as the doctrine of revealed religion, without either destroying the public regard for revealed religion in general, or despising revealed religion under some other form, more agreeable to the design of the revealer, and less adulterated with the doctrines and commandments of men. One might appeal to his Grace's example, who was taught to despise the form of religion *originally his own*, without despising any form that was more to his mind. His Grace's drift is easily seen; and his reasoning, weak as it is, most probably had its effect upon a majority of his audience. Others might say to themselves, *an industrious workman is not always master of his craft.*

he boldly strikes into the high *Roman* road, and attacks the *infallibility* of the scriptures, on the pretence of their being transmitted to us through the hands of *fallible* copyists, *fallible* printers, and *fallible* translators, and all these *fallibilities* established by *fallible* authority.

What is the consequence? Will it follow, that his *creeds* and *confessions* are *infallible?* By no means; the Dean is too modest to assert it: but he will shew you, that *one* sort of *fallibility* is as good as *another,* and that you may make as good a shift with *his,* as with your *own.*

His state of the case is this. "The scriptures "are *infallible* in their *source,* but *fallible* in "their *descent. Creeds* are *fallible both* in "their *source,* and in their *descent.*"* Surely he should have said, at least his *Apology* required he should say, "*Creeds* are *fallible* in "their *source,* but *infallible* in their *descent.*" The antithesis had then been complete, and the wavering christian would have had some ground to debate with himself where to fix his choice; and, by a little of the Dean's rhetoric, might have been brought to allow, that the *infallibility* in the *descent,* or in other words, the *infallibility* of the *conveyance,* (viz. the *clerical society*) would be sufficient to cure all defects in the *source.*

But by allowing that *creeds* are *fallible* in *both* respects, and the *scriptures* only in *one,* and adding, that "it is every man's duty to "make the best of his condition," he has fairly

* P. 23.

given up the cause to the petitioners. Half the common sense of a plough-boy will readily determine, that he *makes better* of his condition, and consequently *does his duty better* who adheres to that system where he has but *one* chance of being deceived, than he who espouses that where he has *two*.

O Domus antiqua, quam dispari dominaris Domino!

Thou hoary vicar of the church on seven hills, thou genuine founder and head of this *clerical society*, how aukwardly do thy rivals, and would be successors, manage thy tools, and ape thine heroic exploits! even like children mimicking the grandeur of thy St. *Peter's* in models of clay!

It seems to be the Dean's opinion, that if the petitioners have any scruples concerning the established *centre of union*, they ought to repair to some other society, where the yoke is not so galling, and especially as there is so ample a toleration for protestant dissenters of different denominations; and he would infer from their remaining in the church, with a manifest disapprobation of the conditions of clerical communion, that they only want to avail themselves of the church's emoluments at all events, which it seems, are better secured in an established, than in a tolerated society.

That is to say, the petitioners desire to earn the wages of the church, but to earn them with a good conscience. And where is the harm of

this? Does Dr. *Tucker* desire to hold his Deanry on any other terms? Does he not desire to have an *internal* sanction for holding it, as well as a merely *legal* one? I cannot tell, let us try him by his own speculations.

The Doctor hath given it under his hand, that the *Athanasian* creed may be proved by most certain warrants of scripture, and yet the petitioners have his consent to part with it. His *ostensible* reason is, that it is *superfluous*. —The passage is remarkable, and you shall have it in his own words.

"As to the *Athanasian* creed, it is really "*superfluous* in our present service; because "the very same doctrine is as *strongly*, though "not as scholastically maintained in the *Ni-* "*cene* creed, the *Litany*, and in many other "parts of our public offices."

I should be very glad to have the opinion of Mr. *Toplady*, or Mr. *Madan*, or even of Dr. *Halifax* on this proposition. So far as my own understanding reaches, I am obliged absolutely to deny the fact. Indeed if common language is to be interpreted by common sense, it is impossible to be true.

The late worthy bishop of *Clogher* (after having shewn from *Socrates* the ecclesiastical historian, that ουσια and υποστασις were, with the *Nicene* fathers, synonymous terms) could not help saying, "it is something odd to have these "two creeds (the *Athanasian* and the *Nicene)* "established in the same church, in one of "which, those are declared to be accursed, "who deny the Son to be of the same *Usia* "or *hypostasis* with the Father; and in the

"other it is declared, they cannot be saved, "who do not assert, that there is one hypos- "tasis of the Father, and another of the Son, "and another of the Holy Ghost."*

It is true, this *curse* is not subjoined to the *Nicene* creed, as it is now used in our public service. Our present form is taken from the popish offices, and not from *Socrates;* and the reason of omitting the *Anathema* at the end of it, is obvious: for it is in that formula of execration, that the ουσια and υποστασις are used as synonymous terms. If any dextrous copyist had but contrived to drop the *Hypostasis* in the *descent* of this creed, the *Anathema* would probably have been added to it in the Roman Ritual, and consequently in our communion service, and then we should have been cursed in the *Nicene* creed, for believing what we are cursed in the *Athanasian* for *not* believing. Another material difference between these two creeds, shall be noted presently.

"And as the damnatory clauses," the Dean goes on, "are *seldom rightly understood,* and "therefore too liable to give offence, it were "to be wished that the whole was omitted." —Here I appeal again to the common sense of every man in the kingdom, who understands the following sentence. *If you rob upon the King's highway, you shall be hanged.*

* Eſſay on Spirit, p. 146, Sect. cxlvi. The words of the Athanaſian Creed are, Αλλη γαρ εστιν υποστασις του πατρος, αλλη του υιου, αλλη του αγιου πνευματος. The words of the Nicene council are, τους δε—εξ ετερας υποστασεως ἡ ουσιας φασκοντας ειναι—τον υιον του θεου αναθεματιζει η αγια καθολικη και αποστολικη εκκλησια.

"Indeed," continues the Dean, "there is "another weighty reason for leaving this creed "out of our present forms of public worship, "which, as it is *perfectly sound and orthodox*, "ought to be distincly mentioned. The rea- "son I mean is this: one principal part of the "controversy, which gave birth to the *Atha- "nasian* creed, is now generally, and very "happily forgot, *viz.* the errors of *Sabellius;* "—there being few at this day that ever heard "of his name, and fewer still who have a clear "conception of his singular notions and opi- "nions."

It were happy for *the perfectly sound and orthodox*, if this were really the case. But there are other *Apologetic* writers in the world, besides the worthy Dean of *Glocester*. There is in print, *An Apology* for one *Benjamin Ben Mordecai*, setting forth the reasons for his conversion from the *jewish* to the *christian* religion. This honest and sensible *Hebrew*, appears to have as clear a conception of the notions and opinions of *Sabellius*, as the Dean of *Glocester* himself, and from him we learn, that they are not *singular*. From his account it appears that they have been the notions and opinions of certain learned clerks of the church of *England*, who have hitherto been esteemed, not only *perfectly sound and orthodox* themselves, but *perfectly sound and orthodox* interpreters of the *Athanasian* creed.

"I shall now consider," says this learned *Israelite*, "the doctrine of the *Trinity*, as laid "down by Dr. *Waterland*, and several other "modern writers, who, in many particulars,

"differ from one another; all of them from the "most ancient fathers, *and especially from* "ATHANASIUS; and yet affect, one and all, to "defend their notions under the authority of "HIS name."*

Having shewn this at some length, he scruples not to call these writers, with *Waterland* at their head, *Pseudo-Athanasians*, and proves to the satisfaction of every capable reader, that in answering the objections of those they call heretics and heterodox, they espouse by turns the several errors of *Socinus*, the *Tritheists*, and the *Sabellians*,† "and thus," says he, "they "absolve themselves from one heresy, by pro- "fessing another, which is quite opposite to it; "and holding two or more doctrines at the "same time, which are absolutely contradic- "tory to each other."

Now, if there are none of these contradictions in the *Athanasian* creed, (as we are sure there are none in the *most certain warrants* of *scripture*, by which the article says, it may be proved,) the Dean of *Glocester's* reason for omitting it will be found not so *perfectly sound and orthodox* as he would pretend. For if the Doctors *Pearson*, *Cave*, *Bull*, *Waterland*, &c. &c. are proved to be *Sabellians*, though it be only *occasionally*, the Dean can give no *orthodox* reason, why they should not fall under the reproof of the *Athanasian* creed, as well as *Sabellius* himself.‡

* P. 41. † P. 43—45.

‡ That the Dean may not be too much startled at this unexpected accusation of Dr. *Waterland*, we present him with the following an-

The Dean tells us, "This creed cannot be "properly understood, till these tenets, by be- "ing previously known, are contrasted with "their opposite extremes."

ecdote, which may possibly have lurked hitherto in a corner, where he would not look for it. In the year 1749, appeared *Pope's* DUNCIAD, published by Mr. *Warburton*, the reputed author of the *Notes*. The commentator, after acting as *second* to Mr. *Pope*, in this poetical *Bear-garden*, concludes his operations with a taste of his theology, to the purport following. Having observed, that "cer- "tain scandalous contentions, for modes of faith, have violated christ- "tian charity, and dishonoured sacred scripture," he proceeds to say, —"As particularly the mischievous squabble between *Waterland* "and *Jackson*, on a point confessedly above reason, and amongst "those adorable mysteries, which it is the honour of our religion to "find *unfathomable*. In this, by the weight of answers and replies, "redoubled upon one another without mercy, they made so profound "a progress, that the *one* proved, nothing hindered in *nature*, but "that the *Son might have been the Father*, and the other that no- "thing hindered in grace, but that the *Son may be a mere creature*. "In a word, they made all things disputable but their own dullness, "and this they left unquestioned; and it was the only thing they did "leave, of which their readers could be certain." From this remarkable passage we learn, 1. That it is for the honour of this commentator's religion, that there are *mysteries* in it which he finds *unfathomable*. 2. That the *Athanasian* creed, being of this *unfathomable* depth, and at the same time a part of this commentator's religious system, it may be dishonourable to the commentator's religion, and consequently, not *perfectly sound and orthodox*, to leave this creed out of our present forms of public worship, as the Dean proposes. 3. That Dr. *Waterland* was, with respect to the *divine nature*, a frank *Sabellian*.—But this squabble, concerning the Trinity, was not the only *mischievous* thing in which these disputants were concerned, that scandalized the pious commentator. *Waterland* could not away with the *Divine Legation*, &c. at any rate; [See Middleton's *Misc. Tracts*, 1752, p. 496.] and *Jackson* was not altogether unsuccessful in some printed attacks upon it. This probably intitled these two writers to a place in the *Dunciad*. Otherwise there have been *contentions* as *scandalous*, and *squabbles* as *mischievous* on the doctrine of the Trinity, between other divines of the commentator's acquaintance.

One would think that this might *properly* enough be brought about, by *contrasting* each proposition with its contradictory one.—But the Dean's reason——;

" For all these striking antitheses, which to " *ignorant* and *prejudiced* minds, appear like " so many paradoxes or contradictions, will be " found to be nothing more, *when truly un-* " *derstood*, than so many cautions and preser- " vatives against falling into the errors of *Sa-* " *bellius* on one side, or those of *Arius* on the " other."

Aye, there's the difficulty. *When truly understood*,—but when will that be, if the writer cited in the margin, *truly* says, that the mystery to which these *striking antitheses* relate, is *unfathomable?* But, be that as it may, we have shewn from honest *Ben Mordecai*, that men to whom the Dean himself must not impute either *ignorance* or *prejudice*, are as prone to the heresy of *Sabellius*, as to that of *Arius*. And if we are not to fix our orthodoxy by the standards of such men as *Pearson*, *Bull*, and *Waterland*, we must, I am afraid, go a little farther to get rid of these *apparent paradoxes* and *contradictions*, than the Dean's *ipse dixit*.

Let us however go on with him. " Now as " the *Nicene* creed was particularly intended " as an antidote against *Arianism*—and as " *Sabellianism* is *utterly unknown to our com-* " *mon congregations*, reason good it seems to " be, that a creed, which was intended to guard " against *both* extremes at the same time, and " by the same context, ought to be laid aside " when there is only *one* of these errors now

" remaining—especially as that *one* is already
" as well guarded against as human prúdence
" can devise." p. 59.

I am afraid this reason will prove too much, *viz.* that the *Nicene* creed should be dismissed along with the *Athanasian.* For where is the *common congregation*, that knows more of the *Arian* than the *Sabellian* errors? On the other hand, we can say something from our own experience, and will not be afraid to appeal to that of others, that it is impossible to study the *Arian* controversy so as competently to understand it, without getting at the same time a pretty clear conception of the *Sabellian* tenets. The Dean himself calls them the *two extremes*, and we have seen a thousand times how difficult it is to steer between the two, so as to avoid the one, without being intangled in the other.

The case appears from Ecclesiastical history, to have been this. *Noetus* and *Praxeas*, from whom *Sabellius* derived his notions, were called *Monarchists*, and *Patropassians*, on account of their holding the identity of the οὐσια or ὑποστασις of the Father and the Son, without any distinction of what has been since called *personality.* The *Noetians* and *Sabellians* after them, said, the Divine *Monarchy* could only be preserved upon their hypothesis, and insisted, that the doctrine of their adversaries introduced *two* or *more* Gods.

Origen, *Eusebius* of *Cæsaria*, *Tertullian*, and they in general who are called the *Ante-Nicene* fathers, in opposing these heretics, were apt, in distinguishing between the *hypostasis*

of the Father and the Son, to run into the error of those who were afterwards called *Arians*,* and this is the reason why these fathers are so often appealed to by those who espouse the *Arian* scheme, even to this hour.

The council of *Nice* pretended to adjust these matters, and the orthodox of the present times abide by their determination, which however both the *Nicene*, and our *English* fathers have explained so aukwardly, as to expose themselves over and over to the reproach of *Sabellianism*. And of this they have never been able to acquit themselves, but by deserting their *explanations* of the *Nicene* doctrine, and taking refuge in the *Athanasian*, from which likewise they have been driven in their turn, as may be seen in the *Apology* of *Ben Mordecai* above mentioned. The result then is, that if you take away the *Athanasian* creed, you leave an opening for an influx of *Sabellians*, as it seems, the *Arians* are to be dealt with on no other ground. So *inexpedient* is the Dean's proposal to dismiss this *orthodox* confession of faith.

The Dean concludes this *manœuvre*, by saying, "For undoubted fact it is, that *that Arian*, "whose conscience can digest the *Nicene* "creed, will make no scruples at swallowing "the *Athanasian*."

* Hinc *Apologista Origenis*, apud *Photium*, ingenue fatetur eundem, [*Origenem*] *Sabellii* hæresi semet opponentem, ita in contrarium abreptum fuisse, ut *Arianico* morbo correptus videretur. *Whitby* Disq. Mod. *Appendix*, p. 181. See that whole *Appendix*, from which the account above is chiefly taken.

And where is the wonder of that? For it is undoubted fact, that the *Arian* who can do these feats, would swallow the *Trent* catechism, or the *Shastah* of the *Persians*, with perfect safety to his organs of deglutition, whatever violence he might do to his digestive faculty.

But I believe the *fact* is not so *undoubted* as the Dean's confidence represents it. There are *Arians* who think the τον ἐκ του πατρος γεννηθεντα προ παντων αἰωνων, of the *Nicene* creed sufficiently consistent with their leading tenet, ἦν ποτε, ὁτε ὁ υἱος οὐκ ἦν, to allow them to subscribe to the said creed,* but who would on no account be prevailed upon upon to acknowledge the *proper eternity* of the Son taught in the *Athanasian*, where *eternity* is ascribed to the *Son* and *Holy Spirit*, *in common* with the Father.

I should be loth to think that the Dean says all this without book, and without having examined into the present state of *sabellianism*, as exhibited in the writings of our most approved controversial divines. But if I must allow that he has a *clear conception* of this heresy, he must excuse me, if, considering upon what precarious premises he hath rested his conclusion, I conjecture, that he has some *more substantial* reasons, not so *perfectly sound and orthodox*, for removing the *Athanasian* creed, than he chuses to produce in public.

* It is true, to say, that *there was a time when the Son was not*, is anathematised in this Nicene creed as given by *Socrates*. But the creed having dropped the condemnation of this proposition in its *descent* to these times, the Arians will probably think they may safely take the advantage of the omission, notwithstanding the Dean of Gloucester's *private* anathema.

Be that to himself, and let us proceed to another instance. In the 56th page of his pamphlet, he mentions some doctrines established in our thirty-nine articles, concerning *merit, justification,* and some other points, in the discussing of which, he is not pleased either with the *papists* or the *protestants.* " The " papists," he says, " reasoned *dangerously,* " and the protestants *weakly,* about religious " merit, and though the protestants truly un- " derstood the general grounds of our *justifi-* " *cation* before God, yet they expressed them- " selves so *unhappily* and *incautiously,* as to " give some advantage to their adversaries."

Did not the Dean find some of this *weak reasoning,* this *unhappy* and *incautious expression* concerning justification in the *thirty-nine* articles ? If he did not, why would he rather appeal for a corrective of this *weakness,* &c. to the second homily on salvation, than to the said articles ? But it seems, the learned Dean has " digested his sentiments on these subjects " into a set treatise, the materials of which " he has had by him many years."

Many years may carry us back to a time previous to his subscribing these articles for his Deanry, and these circumstances being laid together, there arises an high probability, that the Dean gave his assent and consent *ex animo,* to all and every of these articles, as *agreeable to the word of God,* even after he had discovered this *weakness of reasoning,* and this *unhappy* and *incautious expresssion,* in some of them ; to which however, I am very unwilling to believe, the scriptures gave *just* oc-

casion, even with all the errors of copyists, translators, and printers, in their most formidable arrangement.*

* Dr. *Tucker* hath lately publiſhed ſix Sermons, and tells us, that "one of his motives for publiſhing the firſt five of them, aroſe "from the very nature of the work in which he is now employed: "for as that is to conſiſt of an expoſition of the doctrine of the church "of England, reſpecting the decrees of God, and his dealings with "mankind as moral agents, it ſeems but *reaſonable*, that the ſcrip-"ture doctrine relating to the ſame points, ſhould firſt be ſet forth, "as the only foundation on which our proteſtant church was origi-"nally erected by our pious reformers." It is difficult to comprehend what the Dean would have us underſtand by this confuſed account of his operations. His deſign, he tells us, is to *expound* the doctrine of the church of England reſpecting the decrees of God, and his dealings with mankind as moral agents, and this we perceive is the ſubject of a work in which he is now employed. But previous to this, he holds it *reaſonable* to ſet forth the *ſcripture doctrine* (as ſomething different, one would think, from the doctrine of the church of England) relative to theſe points. And this we find is the buſineſs of theſe five ſermons. But then he immediately adds, that "*ſcripture doctrine* is the only foundation on which our pious refor-"mers erected our proteſtant church;" and this, we ſuppoſe, they exhibited in the thirty-nine articles. Now it is evident from theſe ſermons, that what the Dean calls *ſetting forth the* ſcripture doctrine of the decrees of God, &c. is neither more nor leſs than *ſetting* forth *his own* interpretation of certain texts of ſcripture, which he underſtands to relate to the ſaid decrees, &c. He would therefore have done well to tell us, in what reſpect it was *reaſonable* to ſet forth *his* ſcripture doctrine, when we had the ſcripture doctrine of our pious reformers ſo fundamentally ſet forth already in the thirty-nine articles; unleſs *his* ſcripture doctrine is different from the ſcripture doctrine of our pious reformers; and in that caſe it ſhould ſeem, that the work in which he is now employed will conſiſt rather in *oppoſing* or *correcting* the doctrine of the church of England, than in *expounding* it. Accordingly if we attend to the Doctor's ſcripture doctrine, we ſhall be tempted to think, that our pious reformers have performed their work very ill; and that it was *reaſonable* for him to begin once more at the foundation, and to erect a quite new fabric of his own. For example. In his firſt ſermon on Romans ix. 21. He ſets out with ſaying, that "the text and the context are WHOLLY

But what then? Shall Dr. Tucker give up his Deanry, and go among the dissenters?

"RELATIVE to the methods of divine providence in beſtowing NATIONAL FAVOURS or in executing NATIONAL JUDGMENTS." Our pious reformers however took this text and the context to it, to relate *wholly*, not to *national*, but to *perſonal* favours, not to the execution of *national* judgments, but to the execution of judgments upon *individuals*, as is abundantly evident by their characteriſing thoſe who are ſaid, in the ſeventeenth article, to be *predeſtinated to everlaſting life*, by *the everlaſting purpoſe of God*, by the term of *Veſſels made to honour*, by which I apprehend, no man would underſtand that they meant, *predeſtinated nations*. In the next place he confines theſe national favours to *temporal bleſſings* beſtowed only in this life, whereas in the article, *everlaſting ſalvation* is the favour expreſsly mentioned to be conferred on the *Veſſels made to honour*. He then takes the caſe of *individuals* into conſideration, and ſhews, in what reſpect the ſimilitude of the potter and the clay will hold with reſpect to them, although he had ſtated the ſimilitude to be *wholly* relative to *national* ſavours and *national* judgments. Laſtly, Dr. Tucker is poſitive that the parallel ought not to be carried farther [than mere temporal favours and judgments] as the ſimilitude cannot juſtify the notion that Almighty God formed any of his creatures with an intent that they ſhould be finally miſerable. Our pious reformers however made no ſcruple to carry the parallel to this concluſion: for having determined the *Veſſels made to honour* to be *thoſe whom God hath choſen in Chriſt out of mankind, to be delivered from curſe and damnation*, and that by his *everlaſting purpoſe*, they did not leave the alternative a ſecret, or a matter of conjecture. For the unavoidable conſequence of their doctrine is, that they who *are not* thus elected and out of whom the others *are* elected, are left or conſigned to curſe and damnation, and that before the foundation of the world was laid, and by virtue of the everlaſting purpoſe of God. And that the reformers were well aware of this conſequence, is clear from the effects they aſcribe to the contemplating this predeſtinating doctrine on the ſide of *reprobation*, namely, deſperation. It was therefore a circumſtance of great civility and tenderneſs to Dr. Tucker in the Monthly Reviewers [from whoſe account of the Doctor's ſermons I raiſe theſe remarks] to decline the taſk of deciding how far the Doctor's expoſition of the doctrines conſidered in theſe ſermons, correſponds with the real deſign and *original* meaning of the articles of our church. If Dr. Tucker does not come within the thunder of the fifth canon, as an impugner of the ſeventeenth article, it would be hard to ſay who does.

Shall he resign his *honourable distinctions*, and renounce the *centre of union*, which he so well approves *in the main?* Does he like every thing among the dissenters so well, as to think their doctrines and modes of worship equivalent in value to such a sacrifice? Let him then be ingenuous, and fairly confess, that there may be some anti-petitioners not so perfectly easy under the bond of subscription, as they may pretend; and who would not like their *honourable* and *lucrative distinctions* the worse, though the *athanasian* creed, and the articles concerning merit and justification, were wholly laid aside. And let him not suppress another undoubted fact, *to wit*, that there is *another sort* of anti-petitioners, who if the *athanasian* creed was dismissed, and the articles new modelled to the Dean of Glocester's taste, would think the church of England as completely undone, as if the prayer of the petition were granted in its fullest extent.

Whether I am mistaken or not in supposing, the Dean's Treatise will not exactly tally with the articles concerning *merit* and *justification*, time will shew.* His disapprobation of the

* It appears in the foregoing note, how far the Dean deviates from the plain ſenſe of our reformers as exhibited in the ſeventeenth article. How he could, after this perſuade himſelf (as he declares in his ſecond Letter to Dr. Kippis, he has done) that "he ſubſcribes to the *tenor* of the Homilies, Articles, and Liturgy of "church of England, in the very *identical ſenſe* in which Cranmer and Ridley had they been now alive, would have wiſhed "that he ſhould have ſubſcribed to *them*," his foregoing repreſentation of the contents of theſe homilies, &c. will hardly help us to conceive. If indeed we attend to the conſtruction of the ſentence, there ariſes a probability, that in Dr. Tucker's account, it may be

protestant way of explanation on these heads, favours the supposition not a little. But let

one thing thing to subscribe to the identical *sense* of the *tenor* of a proposition, and *another* to subscribe to the *identical* sense of the proposition itself. We limbs of the law, make a difference between the *tenor*, and the *purport* of a writing, as is now pretty well understood from a memorable incident of no long standing, when it was determined, that the tenor signified the *ordo* or *series verborem*, and the purport, the general sense or scope of the writing, whether set forth *in hæc verba*, or not; and for which we have from Sir Henry Spelman, the elegant latin word *proportatio*. Whether Cranmer and Ridley were acquainted with this learned distinction of the law, may be questioned, or whether they would have been satisfied with a subscription to the identical sense of the tenor of their articles? What sort of a subscription they wished for, shall be inquired into in its place. In the mean time let us proceed with the Epistolizer. "If "the exiles driven out by the persecutions of Queen Mary, on their "return home from those calvinistical places, Frankfort and Ge- "neva, chose to understand Cranmer's and Ridley's words in a sense "different from what Cranmer and Ridley ever intended, that is "no charge against me, I am not answerable for their mistakes or "perversions." The hypothesis, you see, is, that these exiles either mistook the words of the articles, &c. or perverted them to a sense which Cranmer and Ridley never intended. Let us relate the plain matter of fact, and then we may possibly find out, for what the Dean is really answerable. Dr. Jewel, afterwards bishop of Salisbury, and Alexander Nowel, afterwards dean of St. Paul's, were two of these exiles. The latter was prolocutor of the convocation 1562-3, when King Edward's articles were corrected and reformed, and there is sufficient evidence in Strype and others, that both he and Jewel had no inconsiderable hand in the said correction and reformation. In the year 1571, these articles were again corrected and reformed. and it was resolved in convocation, that "when the book of articles touching doctrine, should be fully "agreed on, then the same should be put in print. by the order "and direction of the bishop of Salisbury." [Jewel] From that time, the *words*, or if you please, the *tenor* of the articles, were no longer the *words* or the *tenor* of Cranmer and Ridley, but rather the words or the tenor of Jewel, Nowel, and their assistants in correcting and reforming them; and whatever *sense* or *purport* these (who are known to be calvinists) *chose* to put upon them, was the *sense* and *purport* ratified by the Queen, and confirmed by act of

the supposition be ever so punctually verified by the event, the Dean will find a very sub-

Parliament; consequently, as sure as ever the dean of Gloceſter ſubſcribed the preſent articles of the church of England, *bona fide*, ſo ſurely did he bind himſelf to the identical ſenſe of theſe exiles and others who theologiſed as they did. And yet ſo callous is he to theſe plain truths, that he ſends Dr. Kippis to the Theſes of the Britiſh divines at Dort, to Prynne, Hickman, Carleton, Edwards, &c. for a liſt of thoſe artifices, chicanries, idle diſtinctions, mental reſervations and ſubterfuges, which the calviniſts in general are forced to uſe in order to gloſs over their ſubſcriptions to the *original* doctrines of our church. But the calviniſts have been before hand with the Dean in this kind of controverſial craft, and have long ago, from Playfere, Heylin, Pierce, and others, brought glaring inſtances of the chicanrie, idle diſtinctions, falſe gloſſes, and groſs prevarication of the ſubſcribing arminians. Nor is it ſo eaſy as Dr. Tucker may imagine, to turn the tables upon the calviniſts. If in an evil hour for the Dean of Gloceſter, a ſenſible reader of his ſecond letter to Dr. Kippis ſhould proceed to examine the writings of theſe calviniſts, or even the writings of Hickman only, I am much miſtaken if he would not find reaſon to doubt whether the Dean underſtands the true ſtate of the controverſy between the calviniſts and arminians; or what were the original doctrines of the [proteſtant] church of England; or conſequently, what was the ſenſe Cranmer and Ridley put upon thoſe words, which, he ſays, the returning exiles miſtook or perverted; notwithſtanding his ſelf-confidence in the ſecond of theſe two prating epiſtles. It is clear from authentic writings which Cranmer hath left behind him, that his firſt opinions concerning the predeſtinarian ſyſtem, were adopted from Luther and thoſe German divines who, in agreement with him, eſpouſed the doctrine of abſolute and irreſpective decrees in the moſt rigid ſenſe. His intimacy afterwards with Peter Martyr, (the oracle likewiſe of Jewel and Nowel) affords not even the ſhadow of a preſumption that he qualified his ſentiments on theſe ſubjects, unleſs perhaps by ſome *equivocal* expreſſions to conciliate the minds of ſome moderate papiſts to the reformation. That Martyr was a determined calviniſt, appears from his Letters to Calvin, and his defence of Zanchius's Theſis; which, it is remarkable, he ſays, were agreeable to the doctrine of Luther and Bucer. And for Zanchius's orthodox calviniſm, we have an unexceptionable voucher in our modern fataliſt, Auguſtus Toplady. The indecent and falſe reflections upon the *Marian* exiles (which, as well as the moſt of his materials in this

stantial voucher for his *orthodoxy*, in the following apology, which however I did not much expect from the quarter whence it came.

" The *Peace of Society* ought with us to be " the first object, and it is certainly better in " a *political* sense, that a few *prevaricators* " that *make a trade of religion*, should enter " the church, than that *order* and *good govern-* " *ment*, should be *subverted*, a catastrophe in " which the success of this petition would cer- " tainly terminate."*

But why even a *few* prevaricators? The object of the petition was, to prevent *any* prevarication; and till the catastrophe above mentioned is rendered probable by some evident indication, it may be asked, in what respect it

second letter to Dr. Kippis, the Dean hath borrowed from the notorious Peter Heylin) are very properly reproved, and effectually confuted by the very learned Hickman, in his *Animadversions on* Heylin's *Quinquarticular History*, p. 204. Ed. 2. The Dean may flounce and struggle as much as he pleases to pin his faith upon Cranmer and Ridley, he will be no nearer his exculpation. If he could prove that these bishops differed in opinion as to predestination from the *Marian* exiles, (which he never will be able to do) it would be of no service to him. It will be only *his* particular subterfuge. An honest subscriber cannot adopt it. Bishop Jewel in a letter to Peter Martyr, bearing date Feb. 7, 1562, hath shut the door upon all senses but the calvinistical. *In dogmatis*, says this worthy prelate, *prorsus* OMNIA *ad vivum resecavimus, et ne latum unguem abfumus a doctrina vestra.* The question is not whether the calvinists or the arminians, are in the right, but whether we are to take the doctrines of the church of England upon the credit of Messieurs Heylin and Tucker, or from the authentic accounts of Bishop Jewel and others, who were immediately concerned in framing and establishing them.

* See the St. *James's* Chronicle, *February* 25, 1772.

would be *better* that these *few* prevaricators and traders in religion should enter the church? It is possible that, *few* as they might be, they may have large congregations under their pastoral care, perhaps whole dioceses; and surely something should be ventured in a christian country, that the religious instruction and edification of christian men may not be trusted to those, who, from their wicked principles, can neither be sincere teachers, nor worthy examples.

It is said, a little before, that "the whole "body of the clergy oppose the petitioners, "and treat their project, not only as *mad* and "*frantic*, but as *irreligious* and *antichristian*."

We can hardly doubt but the speaker was informed, that this was the sense of the *whole body of the clergy*; he might however have justly questioned the truth of the deposition, from the very absurdity of the imputation. *Mad* and *frantic* persons are not properly called *irreligious* and *antichristian*. Both common sense, and the law of the land, forbid to ascribe any *immoralities* to the *insane* and the *lunatic*. I would therefore humbly propose to alter the passage by a slight, but very material correction; and, for *the whole body of the clergy*, would propose to substitute Dr. Tucker's *clerical society*, who, according to his *postulatum* and *inference*, trade in religion *ex professo*. And even these must make their option, and declare, by which of these inconsistent accusations they will abide. They have had but indifferent luck in charging the petitioners with *irreligion* and *antichristianism*. *Madness*

and *frenzy* is the safer calumny to stick by. *Mad* and *frantic* they may be esteemed in endeavouring to exclude prevaricators out of the church, in opposition to the *whole body of the clergy*. This however, it seems, is their project, and could not, in my opinion, be deemed either *mad* and *frantic*, or *irreligious* and *antichristian*, if the *prevaricators who make a trade of religion*, were really few. In that case, some remedy might be found, without *subverting order* and *good government*. But —much comfort may the Dean of Glocester and HIS *clerical society* have in their advocate.

Before Dr. Tucker obliges the public with his treatise on *merit* and *justification*, I would beg leave to give him a little sober advice.

ARNOLD POLENBURGH, in the year 1665, published the second volume of *Episcopius's* works, in the preface of which, he tells the christian reader, that "had not the Dutch "war broke out, he should certainly have de-"dicated that book to the whole body of the "church of England;" for this reason among others, that, "by the providence of God, al-"most all the prelates of that church held the "same opinions, concerning *predestination*, "that *Episcopius* and the remonstrants pro-"fessed."—Upon which a very learned and ingenious writer, who was diven out of the church of England, by the *Bartholomew* Act, makes the following remark: "Whether *Po-*"*lenburgh* be out in his account, is not for "me to inquire, who have work enough to do

" at home; but it seems, even in this gentleman's " account, *all* our bishops are not become " *episcopian ;* and therefore preserve unity " among themselves by *having* their knowledge " in these matters *unto themselves.* Now if it " be found necessary to tolerate difference " of judgments among the bishops themselves " *in doctrines of so high concernment*, it may " be worth the consideration of those who are " in authority, whether they also may not be " suffered to enjoy ecclesiastical preferment, " who differ from their brethren only in some " few points of discipline."

Our worthy prelates (*one* excepted) have been, as far as I know, as wary as their predecessors, in declaring themselves on these points of *high concern.* That *one* is the Dean's immediate superior; and much circumspection will be requisite (so far as I can judge of the Dean's materials by the sample, compared with the prelate's performance) that he brings not forth what my Lords the Bishops chuse to have to themselves, that is to say, that he discovers not how far they may differ from their brother on the bench, concerning the *doctrine of grace*;* the Dean, I dare say, will desire to have it understood, that he delivers the sense of their Lordships on these matters, and his readers will certainly understand so too, should he, unavailed of *Polenburgh's* prudence, dedicate his labours to them.

* A ſhrewd and maſterly writer hath lately ſhewn, upon very ſtrong proof, that the right reverend author of the book entitled, *The Doctrine of Grace*, hath, on the ſubject of atonement, advanced a ſyſtematical paragraph, *diametrically oppoſite both to the*

Without borrowing the least spark of prophetic illumination from the *Foundery* or the

ſcripture, common ſenſe, and orthodoxy. [See a tract, intitled, *Confuſion worſe confounded*, &c. printed for Hingeſton, 1772, p. 35.] It is not eaſy to treat of the doctrine of chriſtian *juſtification*, without conſidering along with it that of chriſtian *atonement*. The Dean therefore would do well previouſly to reconnoitre the ground on which he is about to engage, that he may not unwittingly turn his arms againſt the Colonel of his own regiment, and thereupon bring about a cataſtrophe much more deplorable than the *ideal* ſubverſion of order and good government; that is to ſay, the *real* ſubverſion of all conſiſtency of interpretation on the doctrine of the articles relating to thoſe ſubjects. The biſhop is ſaid to have contradicted a paſſage in the communion ſervice. *ib.* If the Dean ſhould do as much for one or more of the articles, what a triumph would this be for the petitioners? I have a right to expect the Dean of Glocester's thanks for this ſeaſonable intimation. Upon looking into the ſecond edition of *the Doctrine of Grace*, &c. ſince this note was written, it appears, that the propoſition objected to, and confuted by the ingenious author of *Confuſion worſe confounded*, do not ſtand together, as in the citation referred to above. They are indeed all in the ſecond edition of 1763, *totidem verbis*, but ſeparated by much intervening matter, which however hath not at all affected the propriety of the criticiſms in this maſterly pamphlet. How the paſſage is exhibited in the firſt edition, I have no opportunity to know. But there is an expreſſion, p. 2. of the ſecond edition which I may be permitted to note, not as a divine, but as a retailer of law. The language is this. "If man was to be reinſtated in a FREE-GIFT, which he had juſtly *forfeited*"—In our law books, a *free-gift*, is a gift without conditions, and they ſay, that where no conditions are broken, nothing can be *juſtly forfeited*. But what if man was to be reinſtated in this free-gift? Why then, "The reſtoration might be made on what conditions it beſt "pleaſed the giver." It might ſo, if the man was too poor to go to law with the giver, who having freely given the gift, and without conditions, had effectually parted with his property in it, and could not reſume it without injuſtice, and therefore ought to reſtore it without any conditions. And to this agrees the caſe in the record. *Life* was the gift, but a gift given upon a condition, which condition being broken, the gift was forfeited, and juſtly. But though common law, common ſenſe, and matter of fact conſpire to condemn

Locke Hospital, I venture to forbode, that fire and water are not more opposite in their several operations, than the bishop's *present*, and the Dean's *future* system of *merit*, *justification*, *atonement*, &c. And we are prepared already to expect, that iron and clay will incorporate with equal facility, as the doctrines of Messrs. *Shirley*, *Pietas*, *Toplady*, *Madan*, &c. may be brought into agreement with either of them.

Yet they are all *orthodox*, and with the utmost confidence, filiate their inconsistencies on the poor church of England, which must, it seems, answer for them all; and in this presumption, they throw her articles at each others head, with a clamour that drowns her *still*, *mournful* voice, representing, that *her* religion is founded in the *bible only*, and has nothing to do with their fantastical notions, let them derive them from what *other* source they will.*

this reasoning, it may, for ought I pretend to know, be *found divinity*. But there is another doctrine in this first chapter, which I think a little concerns Dr. Tucker. We are told in it, that it is one part of the office of the Holy Ghost to *rectify the will*. Now Cranmer and Ridley tell us, that the Holy Ghost maketh men to will, that have no will to do good things, which they explain by his taking away the stony heart and giving an heart of flesh. Now if Dr. Tucker subscribes the tenth of our present articles, in the sense in which Cranmer and Ridley would have wished he should subscribe it, he must adopt this very sense of the preventing grace which causeth us to have a good will. But this is as different a thing from *rectifying* the will, as the repairing an old house is different from taking away an old house, and building a new one in its place.

* "I hear that some who (having a mind to talk of what they "do not understand) apply themselves to rail against *The Reasonableness of Christianity*," (Mr. Locke's book so called) "in that "phrase with which the worst of men made such a noise under the "*late reigns*, affirming upon their own word, that it is contrary to

In the midst of all this uproar, the Dean of Glocester on the one hand, and the methodists on the other, tell her, that if she parts with these same articles, which furnish an eternal fund for this sort of brawling, she is utterly undone. And in full contemplation of this *undoubted fact*, to what does all this tragic grimace, of *destruction, utter subversion* of *order and good government*, &c. made *special* to the views of the petitioners, amount? Even to the contents of

——— *a tale*
Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
Signifying nothing.

For what would the true protestant church of *England* lose by giving up these bones of contention, but a few rotten buttresses, in too mouldring a state to be of any essential use, and which, by the repeated operations of propping and whitening, serve only to conceal her real beauty, and to impair her strength.

The Dean however at length allows, that, "the great principles both of natural and revealed religion, might have been expressed "in *a more methodical manner*, and with *greater*

" *the church of England.* If these people are capable of thinking, " would they exercise that faculty to any good purpose, they might " easily perceive, that when Jesus Christ and his apostles have de- " termined a point, it is the most scandalous and wicked aspersion " that can be devised to introduce *the church of England* in oppo- " sition to them. Had these people that respect for, and would " pay to *the church of England* that deference which is due to her, " they would not prostitute her venerable name at every turn." *Bold's* Preface to *Observations on the Oxford Animadversions on* Locke's *Reas. of Christianity.*

"*precision*, than they are expressed in the "*thirty-nine* articles." He allows too, "that "some useful abbreviations might be made in "our liturgy, and some expressions *altered* "and *amended*."

It is certainly a good work to mend things that are out of repair; but it is a better work to replace them with things that will never want repairing; and this, I apprehend, is the view and the desire of the petitioners.

As this, however, is a concession which every one will not make,* it may seem at least to intitle the Dean of Glocester to a little reputation on account of his *candor*, and he cannot complain that it has been denied him.†

But the Dean should have considered, that his present disputation is with men who scruple to subscribe, not particularly to the *thirty-nine* articles, but to *any* articles of *faith*, of merely human composition, and whose agreement with scripture is doubtful and precarious. To such men, this concession, I imagine, will give little satisfaction, at least till the Dean has *proved*, what he here seems to take for granted, *viz.* that the thirty-nine articles *express*, even in their present state, *the great principles both of natural and revealed religion;* for all that he would propose by *his* alterations, is to give them a little method and precision in the article of expression, leaving the principles just as

* It has been reported, that the bishops, or some, or one of them, when consulted concerning the expediency of admitting this petition into parliament, answered, *there is no occasion for* any *alterations*.

† Monthly Review for *February*, 1772, p. 158.

he finds them. And this probably would be as far as he would venture. For, should he be one of those *candid* and *impartial* men who are willing to lend an helping hand to the good work, and should he, by varying the method or the expression, happen to vary the complexion of the principle, an unlucky retrospect to his former subscription might be suggested, and bring on suspicions, that his private convictions did not altogether tally with the principles of this public Apology, when it made its first appearance.

Now, all the world sees, it is in view of the hazard of adulterating or disguising *the great principles of natural and revealed religion*, in tampering thus with them by *art and man's device*, that the petitioners propose to substitute the *genuine scriptures* in the room of all other tests of the article-kind. Can the Dean of Glocester alone be ignorant of this? If he is not, can he be *serious*, can he be *sincere*, in calling upon the petitioners for a *plan of their own*, after they have so often held out to him *the pure word of* GOD, as the only plan to which it is either *safe* or *equitable* for them to be bound, under a protestant establishment?

And, for heaven's sake, what would the Dean do with this *plan* of the petitioners, if he had it? He tells you. He would *scrutinize* it; just, I suppose, as the Savoy-bishops scrutinized Richard Baxter's Liturgy, by taking occasion from it, to ridicule and abuse both the plan and the author of it. The petitioners may indeed fall into this snare if they will; but, *in vain*, says Solomon, *is the net spread in the*

sight of any bird; and I hope the gentlemen at the *feathers*, are a little better acquainted with the man and his communication, than to be whistled into it by such an interested piper.

But does the Dean expect that his *own* plan would *not* be *scrutinized?* If the petitioners should let it pass current, is he so little acquainted with the gentlemen of the tabernacle, as to hope that they would subscribe to his more methodical and precise articles? And should they revolt, what amends would he make to his brethren, *Randolph*, *Balguy*, *Halifax*, *Powel*, *Harvest*, &c. who know they can no longer depend upon the aid of these *thorough-paced* champions, than the articles are continued in their present circumstances, without the abatement of a single tittle? It is a thousand pities the Dean should have resigned the only *postulatum* that could secure him from this *scrutinization*, viz. that all *creeds*, *articles*, and *confessions*, which have the sanction of his *clerical society*, "are *infallible in their descent.*"

I desire it may be understood, that these observations relate only to the thirty-nine articles, and the doctrinal points in the liturgy, to which the petitioners are by law bound to subscribe. Subscription to these is the grievance of which they complain, and for which they desire to substitute subscription to the scriptures *only*. As to the alterations and amendments of our public offices in *other* matters, I cannot find they are inclined to intermeddle. These are called for by other persons. No doubt but the petitioners are as sensible of these improprieties in the liturgy, &c. as other

people, and wish to see the church of England free from spots and blemishes, as ardently at least as Dr. Tucker himself. But in such things I think they have declared, they are willing to acquiesce in the wisdom of their superiors. They must acknowledge, that there are clergymen of great learning, accurate judgment, liberality and candour of mind, who have not joined them in their petition, and who are every way equal to the task of reforming our public service, even though they should except the Dean of Glocester, and those who oppose them on *his* principles, out of the number.

But now for the Dean's *drawback* upon his concessions. "But nevertheless," says this acute apologist, "be it *duly* and *solemnly* ob-"served, that IMPROVING and DESTROYING "are very different things; and that the man, "or set of men, who would gladly engage in "the *one*, would not wish to appear to give "countenance to the *other*. Therefore such "men will chearfully submit to the present in-"conveniencies, *were they greater than they* "*are*, rather than be the coadjutors and fel-"low-labourers in such a destructive design as "yours seems to be."*

* The Dean's abilities as well as his inclination for the buſineſs of reforming, may appear, perhaps, from what has been obſerved before. He gives us another ſpecimen in a note ſubjoined to his ſermon on the penitent thief. I ſhall give it as I find it in the Monthly Review for January, 1773, p. 62. "The form of abſolution in "our office for the viſitation of the ſick, is juſtly liable to cenſure. "—For it pretends to ſuch a knowledge of the human heart, as can-"not belong to any mortal man, without an expreſs revelation. The "prieſt is there directed to ſay to the ſick perſon, *(knowing* him to "be a *true penitent* and a *ſincere believer,) By his* (our Lord

If I remember right, this Reverend Dean, once in his life, pleaded for the *naturalization*

" Jeſus Chriſt's) *authority committed to* me, I *abſolve thee from* " *all thy ſins.* Dr. COMBER endeavours to juſtify this paſſage, " and ſucceeds according to the manner of thoſe who attempt impoſ- " ſibilities. Mr. WHEATLEY offers ſome apologies. The late " Dr. STEBBING in his excellent tract againſt popery, fairly gives " it up as indefenſible. I do the ſame, and eſteem it to be among " the number of thoſe *real* blemiſhes, ſpots, and imperfections in our " church, which *ought* to be removed, *when* a proper OPPORTU- " NITY ſhall preſent." Let me for once plead the cauſe of the church, and of her champion Dr. Comber, againſt this ignorant and injurious accuſer. In the firſt place there is not one word in the Rubrics preceding this abſolution, concerning the prieſt's *knowing* the *true repentance* and the *ſincere belief* of the ſick perſon; and if there were, Dr. Comber's manner of juſtifying this form of abſolution, ſhews, that there are good grounds for aſcribing this knowledge of the human heart to the prieſt. " JESUS," ſays this eminent liturgiſt, " gave this power to his Apoſtles, and they to their ſucceſſors, who " communicated it to us by prayers and impoſition of hands at our " ordination, ſaying, *receive ye the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſins ye remit,* " *they are remitted,* &c." Whence he concludes, (and while he is in poſſeſſion of his premiſes, who can gainſay him?) that the prieſt has really and effectually the power and authority he pretends to in this form of abſolution. If the prieſt at his ordination really and *bona fide* receives the Holy Ghoſt, and a power of remitting ſins, he muſt along with them, receive all the qualifications neceſſary for the full diſcharge of his function, and among the reſt, the knowledge of the human heart. If the prieſt is really endowed with the gift of the Holy Ghoſt, he has no occaſion for an expreſs revelation to know the inward diſpoſition of his ſick penitent: and Mr. Wheatley in that caſe, apologiſes for what he ought to have defended; and the Drs. Tucker and Stebbing may be conſidered as traiterous ſons of the church, for giving up as *indefenſible*, ſo beneficial and ſo authentic an adjunct of their office. If the prieſt does *not* at his ordination *receive the Holy Ghoſt*, the form pretending to confer it is a mere deluſion, a profane and an abominable impoſture, and Dr. Tucker ought to have begun with cenſuring *that*, before he meddled either with the abſolution, or with Dr. Comber. But let us not be too preſuming. Perhaps to touch the ordination office, might call in queſtion the powers of more than mere prieſts, and might be interpreted to be a part of that *deſtructive deſign* of which the wicked

of foreign protestants, and afterwards for the *naturalization of Jews;* both these, he insisted, would be considerable IMPROVEMENTS. I have now a pamphlet before me, wherein he was told, that these projects were DESTRUCTIVE of the constitution, particularly, of the church of England. Does he remember what answer he gave to this objection? Let him apply it to the case in hand, and the world will see, that he stands exactly in the same predicament with respect to the petitioners, in which he exhibited his opponents at those several periods.*

But wherein consists the *destructive* part of the design of the petitioners? why, truly, in substituting *assent* and *consent*, to the *pure word of God*, instead of *assent* and *consent* to *creeds*, *confessions*, and *articles*, "some of "which are *superfluous*, others, *want method*, "*precision* and *perspicuity in expressing the*

petitioners are accused. In conclusion, we are to wait, it seems, for the removal of this impious form of absolution, till a *proper opportunity shall present;* that is, till an opportunity drop of itself from the clouds; for at the Dean's rate of reforming, a proper opportunity will neither be sought, nor presented from any other quarter, by those who have the power to make a *proper* use of it. In the mean time, the patient Dean submits to the present inconveniencies, and would submit, *were they greater than they are.*

* I can conceive a petitioner concluding a pamphlet in answer to Dr. Tucker with some such words as these. "But alas! after all, "what can we expect from such a world as this? The scheme be- "fore us is of too *enlarged* and *noble* a nature to be rightly compre- "hended and truly relished by *narrow* and *contracted* minds. It "clashes with the interests of too many persons to be likely to suc- "ceed; and I am afraid I may apply to the petitioners the words I "heard in a case not very different from theirs:—*Sirs, this is all* "*right, but it will never do; it is* TOO HONEST." *Vid.* Tucker's *Essay on Trade*, Ed. 1750. p. 165.

Quam temere in nosmet legem sancimus iniquam!

"*great principles both of natural and revealed* "*religion*, and *all* of them *fallible both in their* "*source and in their descent.*"

Will the Dean venture to affirm, that this is the case with the scriptures? If he will not, what must be the consequence? A very obvious one, *viz.* That the substitution of these creeds, articles, &c. instead of *the pure word of God*, must of course be *destructive* to something of infinitely more value to the good old church of England, than *a merely clerical society.*

In the name of common sense, Mr. Dean, pick up your concessions, and put them in your budget as fast as you can. I should laugh at you for producing them, if I did not know, that a man, with a majority on his side, can never be ridiculed out of his grossest absurdities. I have another reason for giving you this advice. Take these creeds and articles in the state you have represented them, and it is questionable whether there is a thinking man in the kingdom sufficiently callous to subscribe them in the terms of the 36th canon, without *prevarication.*

I pass by the curious and orthodox supposition couched in the last period of this lamentable paragraph;—that "it is better to submit to "the present inconveniencies, *were they greater than they are*," (even, suppose, to the *inconveniencies of popery,*) "*than* to substitute a "subscription to the scriptures only, in the "room of our creeds and articles." For surely any inconveniencies are more eligible than absolute destruction.

The case of candidates for degrees, &c. in our universities, shall be spoken to presently; in the mean time, let us contemplate another of the Dean's concessions.

—"More especially, let the ministers of dissenting congregations, if they will chuse to apply, be heartily wished a good deliverance from the burden of our subscriptions."

I wish this gracious indulgence to dissenters, was not forced from the angry Dean in pure spite to the petitioners. For why else, *more especially?* Speaking of persons commencing graduates, either in arts, law, physic, or *music*,* he says, "there doth not appear any STRICT

* The idea of requiring subscription to the thirty-nine articles from commencers in music, is a chearful one. It is pity the petitioners should forget them in their application. "An organist," says *La Roche*, "having declared, that if they would set the canons of "*Dort* to music, he would play them upon the organs, but that he "could not subscribe them, with a good conscience, was turned out "of his place." Hist. Reform. p. 563. Whether this organist was a graduate in the science he professed, or not, is not said. Perhaps in the country where he officiated, degrees in the faculty of music were not conferred. Perhaps too they had no rubrics to direct the practical uses of church music. The case is different with us. Organists may be graduated; and divers of our forms, particularly the Athanasian Creed, are directed in the rubrics to be *sung* or said; and it may be among the excellencies of our church, that she provides against heretical *airs* as well as heretical speeches. A caviller might object indeed, that the rubrics say nothing of *playing* the creeds, &c. But this argument, I fear, would prove too much; it would prove that we have no authority for organs in our churches; whereas, bishop Burnet tells us, they were *established* in the convocation of 1562; and this being likewise the same convocation which in Mr. Strype's phrase, *so well dispatched* the doctrine of the church in the thirty-nine articles, the subscription of a musical Doctor may seem to be as consequential with respect to the good of the church, as that of a Doctor of divinity.

" PROPRIETY IN THE REASON OF THINGS, " for requiring *their* subscriptions."

Now, when we bring subscription to articles of faith or doctrine in the church of England to this test of *strict propriety* and *the reason of things*, we must go a little deeper, I apprehend, than the *accidental* or *political* ordinances of an human establishment, even to the *principles* of a *christian* and a *protestant* church. When the church of England renounces these principles, as being no part of her *establishment*, we will cease to argue with the Dean on the *strict propriety* of his Apology *in the reason of things*. But if she has given the Dean of Glocester no commission to renounce them in her name, he must explain to us, how *strict propriety in the reason of things* operates with respect to subscriptions to human creeds and articles, more in favour of ministers of dissenting congregations, than in favour of ministers of *any* christian and protestant congregations whatever. What reason can the Dean give why dissenters should be excused from this *burden*, which will not reach the case of the petitioners?*

* " The ſtrict meaſures taken at the reſtoration, were not approved " by the famous Dr. *Whichcot*, but were thought by him to be " much too ſevere, and the effects only of a ſtrong party-prejudice. " *I plainly ſee*, ſaid the Doctor, *what they would be at, but I ſhall* " *diſappoint them. I can myſelf, with a good conſcience conform,* " *though others cannot, whom I greatly pity, heartily wiſhing them* " *more liberty*, AS REALLY DUE TO THEM BY THE LAWS OF " NATURE, AND THOSE OF THE GOSPEL." Now if this liberty was due to theſe honeſt men by theſe immutable laws, they were *moſt unjuſtly driven out of the church* for want of it. Will the Dean of Gloceſter condeſcend to inform us, why equal liberty is not, by the ſame laws, and in a caſe of the ſame kind, due to the petitioners?

Will he tell them, that as the dissenters do not aspire to the *honourable distinctions*, or the *temporal possessions* of the church, it is not *fit* or *proper* they should bear the *burdens* of the church; and that *strict propriety in the reason of things* requires, that they only should bear the *burden* who are paid for it?

So then! OUR subscriptions *are* a *burden;* and it might seem, after the Dean had dropped this inauspicious word, that he would have been so kind as to have mentioned, by what, or whose authority, it is bound and laid upon our shoulders?

"No matter, you are paid for bearing it." ——Say you so, Mr. Dean? And do the *whole body of the clergy* really *make a trade of religion?* Let us cease to wonder then, if the *trade* should fail, that the poor church of England must become a *bankrupt.*

Unfortunate Apologist! To what contempt and detestation would you expose your indulgent mother, *ridente papista, nec dolente Atheo,* if your sophistical trumpery should pass for *her* genuine principles!

Let us proceed with the Dean's concession. Who that is acquainted with the valuable labours of *Pierce, Hallet, Forster, Taylor, Chandler, Doddridge, Lowman, Lardner,* &c. would not wish with Dr. *Jortin——Utinam essent nostri.*

It was the wish of such men as *Whichcot, Tillotson, Burnet, Tennison,* and above all, of that true protestant patriot, King *William,* with respect to their excellent predecessors,

whose conformity should have been, and deserved to have been purchased, by removing every circumstance out of our public forms, which could possibly be a reasonable obstruction to it: and could the influence of these worthies of our *establishment* have prevailed over the monkish and malicious bigotry of those times, it would have been effected. The men indeed, who gave the ply to those times, were wise enough in their generation. The admission of such conformists into the church, would either have sunk these opposers into insignificance, or have made their manners and principles odious to the whole world, when set in contrast with the free, generous spirit, and the pious and laborious deportment of a *Calamy*, or a *Howe*.

Why may we not presume, that there are at this hour, numbers of dissenting ministers, whose learning, abilities, and other valuable qualities, would do honour to *any* religious establishment; and that there are as few among them in proportion, who would be a disgrace to *any*, as are to be found in our own?

May I then have leave to solicit the worthy Dean's answer to the following queries? Does not the spirit of christianity require, that room should be made in our establishment (considered as a christian establishment) for these fellow-labourers, who build upon the same foundation that we do, *the sufficiency of the scriptures to make us wise unto salvation?* and with whom, and with St. *Paul*, we ought to agree, that *other foundation can no man lay, than is*

laid, which is, Jesus Christ? Would not such an accession of strength to the protestant cause, as an ecclesiastical union with such valuable characters would produce, be desirable, even in a *political* view, by removing our establishment still farther from popery? Would the Dean's *more methodical* and *precise* articles, or the corrections he proposes in the liturgy, bring about the happy reconciliation required? If they are calculated for this end, why is subscription to them called, with respect to ministers of dissenting congregations, a BURDEN? If not, would not the releasing of these ministers from this *burden*, whilst it is bound about the necks of the established clergy, tend to make this reconciliation absolutely impracticable? And may not the Dean be justly suspected to have proposed this indulgence of dissenting ministers, with an especial view to this impracticability?

The case at present with the dissenting ministers, with respect to conformity is this. If they can get over a few objections to the modes of church goverment, and particularly to the article of re-ordination, they have a much less step to take towards the established church, than it is to assent to certain doctrinal propositions contained in the articles they are still obliged to subscribe. When they can get their own consent to undergo this piece of discipline, the rest is, in comparison, of much less consequence; and accordingly several of them have conformed, by whose labours the church, upon the whole, hath lost no credit, though some

few, by striking into the high orthodox road at full speed, may have disgraced both the system they left, and that which they espoused.

The Dean's expedient would effectually shut this door, at least upon the worthiest and most conscientious part of them, by making their conformity more difficult and embarrassing than ever. No matter; the more plenty there will be of *offices*, *honourable distinctions*, and *temporal possessions* for the *hereditary* children of the church. And as the case of subscription is now likely to be more generally, as well as better understood since the sixth of February, 1772, the Dean may indulge his genius in the probable prospect, that many of the youth designed for the church, may, upon a serious consideration of the *burden*, decline the condition annexed to her emoluments, and leave them to those who can swallow the bitter pill with less offence to their stomachs.

It is however, and must be to all true friends of christian liberty, a most grateful effect of the late controversy concerning subscriptions, that the dissenting clergy should be relieved from this injurious condition inserted in the very law which tolerates their worship, upon whatever principle the relief is forced from the politicians of the present day. But if they are intitled to *this* indulgence upon *political* principles, they are intitled to *more* upon *better* principles. If their ministry is equally effectual in making men good christians, and good subjects, as that of established clergymen, the public is, in proportion to their numbers, equally benefited by their labours, and ought in

justice to confer upon them a proportionable share of the public profits. And if in this view an incorporation is necessary, reason, justice, and the gospel direct, that where in conscience they cannot come up to us, we should go down to them, while their demands are reasonable, and founded upon an evangelical doctrine which is *common to us both.** If their ministry is *reprehensible*, and *noxious* to the *christian* and the *subject*, every indulgence in their errors should be denied them, and their houses of public worship shut up.

* I am sorry to observe, that in the printed *Case* the dissenters distributed to the members of parliament, they should give it as a *twelfth reason*, that, " The reasons for which subscription is deem- " ed necessary under an *establishment*, do not extend to the case of " a *toleration*." Had this reason been penned by Dr. Tucker, I should not have marvelled; his established maxims are maxims of traffic, wherein *opinions* are *saleable*, as well as other things. But a doctrine of this kind advanced in the same paper, where it is asserted, that, " the liberty desired is *agreeable*, not only to *the rights* " *of men and christians*, but to the *sentiments of the best writers*, " to *the principles of sound policy* and to *the spirit of the constitution*, looks as if, in the opinion of the dissenters, the Petitioners of February 6, were neither *men*, *christians*, nor members of the British constitution, and that the dissenters *only* were intitled to be dealt with according to *the sentiments of the best writers*, *the principles of sound policy*, *and the spirit of the constitution*. Since these reflections were first published, the rational part of the dissenters, may, it is to be hoped, have become a little more equitable. What the Vinerian Professor of Oxford advanced in parliament, March 25, 1773, on the behalf of such of their opponents as dissent from the establishment as well as themselves, may be reasonably supposed to have rectified their notions on the subject. If the Professor was right with respect to the power of the civil magistrate, he was no less right in extending it to the dissenters, than to the petitioners at the Feathers Tavern. If he was wrong, the civil magistrate has no more right to prescribe doctrines to any public teacher of the christian religion of the establishment, than to prescribe them to pub-

But, leaving the Dean of *Glocester* a while to his own meditations, let us return to the terrors of the politician.

lic teachers among the diſſenters. The Profeſſor's arguments, taken from the uncertainty of the canon of ſcripture, and the perni ious conſequences ariſing from indulging either individuals in general, or the heads of ſects, in propagating their particular interpretations of ſcripture, militate againſt the original principle of the proteſtant reformation, as well as againſt any particular ſect of proteſtants. It is indeed neither more nor leſs than the old popiſh argument againſt the *ſufficiency* of ſcripture, which one would hope is current no where in the Britiſh dominions, unleſs in certain *keen atmoſpheres*, where the doctrine of toleration is equally in diſrepute, as it is in France or Spain. The Profeſſor's maxim, of, *Idem velle, ec idem nolle*, (which by the way is not from *Tully* but from *Salluſt*) would, if applied to the extent of its political uſes, bring the diſſenters under the pains and penalties preſcribed in our laws for uniformity with a vengeance. Moſt of the adverſaries to the diſſenters' bill, have taken exactly the ſame ground with this occaſional advocate; and they who deviated from this beaten track, obliged themſelves to maintain the irreverend hypotheſis, that the thirty-nine articles were equally authentic with our Saviour's ſermon on the mount; and that by diſmiſſing the articles, a way would be opened for ſtriking the goſpel of St. Matthew off the liſt of divine writings. See the Gentleman's Magazine for October, 1773. On the other hand, the advocates for the bill generouſly went upon the proteſtant principle in its juſt extent; and I think one might venture to ſay, that not one of their arguments which concluded deciſively for the diſſenters, but concluded likewiſe with equal force for the petitioners of the eſtabliſhment. One ſuch argument I ſhall beg leave to exhibit, as it came from a gentleman who was a moſt bitter enemy to the petitioners of Feb. 6, 1772. "Much has been urged," ſaid this honourable gentleman, "reſpecting the want of unanimity amongſt the "diſſenters; but I ſhould apprehend, that *the reaſonableneſs of the* "*requeſt*, and *not the numbers* of thoſe who prefer it, is the thing "which ought to determine this houſe in its proceedings and re-"ſolves." London Chronicle, March 20—23, 1773. Yet other Chronicles tell us that this was the very gentleman, who the year before, was for *exacting compliance*, with *whatever doctrines*, *ceremonies*, and *forms* are eſtabliſhed, from thoſe who receive the public money for that very purpoſe. Now the form of ſubſcription

" The success of this petition would cer-
" tainly terminate in the subversion of order
" and good government."

is no leſs *eſtabliſhed* with reſpect to diſſenters, than with reſpect to the clerical petitioners, as they have been called. It is true, the gentleman ſays, the latter receive the public money for the very purpoſe of their complying. Now I ſhould have thought they received the public money for another and a ſomewhat more important purpoſe; the purpoſe of inſtructing the people in the faith and duties enjoined in the chriſtian ſcriptures. If therefore their compliance with certain doctrines of human device, precludes them from complying with the genuine doctrines of the ſcripture, their requeſt to be relieved is certainly as *reaſonable* a requeſt *in its ſelf*, as the requeſt of the diſſenters, and the argument drawn from *numbers*, equally unreaſonable in both caſes. The gentleman's *reaſon* on which he erects his right of exacting compliance with eſtabliſhed doctrines, &c. *viz.* that the clergy receive public money for that very purpoſe, beſides the miſtake above noticed, affects the diſſenters as well as the clergy of the church of England, in all caſes where diſſenting miniſters have an annual income ſettled upon them, in conſequence of their officiating in ſuch a particular meeting-houſe. One ſuch caſe the Vinerian Profeſſor mentioned, and there are not a few inſtances of the ſame ſort all over the kingdom. Theſe ſtipends the diſſenter, provided he *complies* with the law eſtabliſhing the toleration of diſſenters, may recover by law, if they are withheld from him, with the ſame eaſe as the rector may recover his ſubtracted tithes. If he does not qualify himſelf according to the act of toleration, he is no longer a diſſenting miniſter within the protection of the law, but, as Sir William Blackſtone obſerves, a *criminal nonconformiſt*, liable to the pains and penalties from which a compliance with the law would exempt him. Theſe ſettled ſtipends of diſſenting miniſters being appropriated to, are as much *public money* as the revenues of the eſtabliſhed clergy. Every one knows that thoſe revenues aroſe from donations of private benefactors, confirmed at length by law, and regulated by law to this hour. I do not mention the *regium donum*, nor for *what very purpoſe* it is ſaid to be given. It is a noble benefaction, and worthy of the *original* principles of a truly proteſtant conſtitution. But one circumſtance of difference between churchmen and diſſenters, mentioned by the honourable gentleman, I cannot paſs by. He repreſents the diſſenting clergy as applying for relief, by this argument among others, " We cannot agree to the

Hardly so certainly as to verify this propo-
sition upon the mere illustration of its own

" teſts impoſed ; we aſk not honours, we have no aſpiring wiſhes;
" no views upon the purple ; the mitre has no charms for us ; nor
" aim we at the chief cathedral ſeats ; content to paſs our days in
" an humble ſtate, we pray for the ſake of him who is the Lord of
" conſcience, that our conſciences may be relieved from what at
" preſent is a burthen; nor that, aſſuming the garb of hypocrites, we
" may any longer be forced to bear this burthen, or be treated as va-
" grants for acting agreeable to the dictates of ſincerity, and internal
" rectitude." Now what is there in all this that might not with equal propriety be pleaded on the part of the petitioners from the Feathers ? Dr. Tucker, as well as the honourable gentleman, ſhall be their vouchers that they *had no views upon the purple, or the mitre.* According to theſe gentlemen, the aim of theſe petitioners was the *deſtruction* of the purple and the mitre : and I ſuppoſe they who contemplated their petition with a leſs malignant eye, would be very ſure that this mode of petitioning againſt church impoſitions, was not the way to get themſelves exalted to the ſtate and quality of impoſers in their turn. To ſay that the diſſenters aſk not honours, is only ſaying, they aſk them not where they are not to be had ; for where they are, it ſhould ſeem the diſſenters are as little ſhy of accepting them as other mortals. Elſe, whence is it that we find ſo many *doctors* among them ! And may it not be aſked, are there no emoluments or advantages expected, or actually attending upon theſe *honourable diſtinctions?* In the ſort of world we inhabit, it is not very ſafe to become bound for the ſelf-denial of any claſs of mortals whatever in the lump. But I forbear. I honour a great number of individuals among the diſſenting clergy, as moſt valuable men, and am greatly concerned when any of their leſs conſiderate brethren diſparage the general principles they profeſs, by adopting any excluding and ſelfiſh expedients, in order to accommodate themſelves at the expence of thoſe who are as firm friends to public liberty, civil and religious, as any diſſenter in the kingdom. And on this occaſion give me leave to mention a fact, which does great honour to the clerical petitioners, and which has come to my knowledge ſince theſe papers were firſt publiſhed. Very ſoon after the firſt meeting at the Feathers, a ſketch of a bill was produced to ſome of the ſociety, in purſuance of the principle of the petition, whereby, if it ſhould have been paſſed into a law, the proteſtant diſſenters of all denominations would have been relieved, perhaps more effectually than by the bill they offered for their own particular accommodation.

self-evidence. It was said of *Luther*, that he committed two errors in his way of promoting reformation. It was pretended, that he might have had better success, had he not touched the *Pontifical Tiara*, and the *bellies* of the *monks*, which, it seems, were the two grand hinges of *order* and *good government* in the church of Rome. The petition, I apprehend, steers clear of all mistakes of the same kind; it leaves episcopacy in full possession of its legal powers, nor does it tend to diminish the revenue of the church to the value of sixpence. The petition aims only at the restoration of *the pure word of God* to its proper authority, in a province, where even the *royal supremacy* seems tender of interfering. And if by such restoration, the *order* and *good government* of the church would be *subverted*, it will be impossible to persuade some people, that *more order*, and *better government* would not arise out of the ruins.

As I was at a considerable distance from a certain orator, whose sentiments are understood to regulate those of many other men, I might easily misapprehend him, but to me his expressions implied, that he meant to have taken his steps with respect to this petition, as if it had been addressed to himself *alone*.

By turning over so many law books in the way of my profession, I have contracted a sort of disinclination to vest the whole legislative and executive power of this once great kingdom, in the hands of one man; and I cannot reconcile myself to that language, which goes upon a supposition, that a minister of state

may, by his own power and influence, *execute*, as well as *propose*, what plans of *order* and *good government* shall seem expedient to his single wisdom.

But if a gentleman in office *will* affect the character of a chief magistrate, it is for his credit to act the part *consistently*. If the chief magistrate, (considered as having all legislative and executive powers in his hands) takes upon him to establish religion upon his own maxims of *public utility*, passing by all considerations of the *source* from which the nominal religion he would establish pretends to be derived, it must be a disparagement to his authority, and inconsistent with his plan, to admit of a *toleration law* for sects and dissentions, in the least degree. He should adhere strictly to the literal sense of the text, *Compel them to come in.* It is the only text to which he ought to pay any regard. To admit pleas of *conscience*, may be fatal to *order* and *good government*. There may be times and seasons when men of *conscience* may become the majority, and rise up in a formidable body against the establishment. And indeed, such is the caprice of men's minds, when left to chuse their own religion, that there is no providing against such events, but by excluding all operations of *conscience* from the environs of an establishment, by the severest laws that can be devised.

To give an instance from a case quoted on occasion of the affair under our consideration. Mention was made of the liberties taken with the doctrine of the *Trinity*, and taken with impunity, in open defiance " of an act of parlia-

" ment, which has prohibited all disputation " upon that doctrine." But where was *order* and *good government* all this while? Is it not most inexcusable indolence in the politic chief magistrate, to suffer his decrees to be thus set at nought? Should he not strain every nerve to bring these offenders to justice? Not an author, printer, publisher or vender of these disputatious tracts on the *Trinity*, should escape his vigilance or his vengeance. To screen his remissness under the name of *the lenity of government*, is a poor contemptible subterfuge. With an express law on his side, it is his duty to protect his establishment from such gross affronts, at all events. His establishment is not an establishment of *lenity*. It binds about the neck of *conscience* the iron chain of *conformity* with the utmost rigour; and to relax it in any degree, can only serve to give suspicions, that this mighty *leviathan*, with all his pretences of *public utility*, is conscious, that in enacting such laws as this concerning the *Trinity*, and others of the same sort, he exceeds his commission, and is obliged, by such *toleration* to subvert his own maxim. For, laying the interests of *truth* and *religion* out of the case, where is the *public utility* of giving this indulgence to the *hydra of controversy*, in a *civil* sense? If *public utility* is not incommoded by it, what becomes of the politician's grand argument against this petition?

But incongruous as it is in a minister of state, to talk of a power of establishing a *particular* religion, and tolerating a *different* one, *on the same principle*, it is tenfold more absurd in a member of the *clerical society* to use this

lenitive language. *His* fort is not in a plea of *public utility*, but in his own *snug centre of union*. If he puts the men who dissent from him, in a capacity to call in question the principle of his establishment with impunity, it may in the end prove dangerous to his *honourable distinctions* and *temporal possessions*. He should not suffer either the chief magistrate or his subjects, to pry into the validity of his pretensions to either. *Public utility* gives the idea of *black* to one man, and of *white* to his next neighbour. In *one* statesman's notions of *public utility*, it is better to tolerate a few *prevaricators* in the church, who *make a trade of religion*, than to exclude *prevarication* by complying with the petition. A successor may arise, who will think it expedient, and even a point of *public utility*, to examine into the *nature* and *circumstances* of this *trading* in religion, and the result may be, that the *honourable distinctions* are conferred *in the main*, upon unworthy objects, and these *temporal possessions* distributed with a partiality which is a reproach to all *order* and *good government*: nor should I wonder if such examination should take its rise from the intimations dropped in the Dean of Glocester's *Apology for the present church of England as by law established.*

And this reminds me of two or three incidents which have fallen out, since the petition for relief in the matter of subscription, was rejected.

Soon after this event, it was proposed, it seems, to limit the demands of the clergy upon their parishioners to a certain number of years, and to provide, that no claims of tithes, &c.

which had laid dormant, should be admitted against the quiet and uninterrupted possession of the parishioners for that length of time.

A reverend friend whom I met on a visit, in company with three or four of his brethren, made no scruple to put this attempt upon the sacred order, to the account of the petitioners; and as the company were unanimous in that opinion, I left them to enjoy it at their leisure. And yet certain it is, that a bill of this tendency was projected and talked off many months before the petition to remove subscriptions was heard of, or, as I verily believe, was thought of. And there cannot be a stronger proof of the petitioners having no concern in that matter, than that they had not any more determined adversaries in the house of Commons, than were some of the projectors and patrons of this *limiting* bill.

It may, indeed, be a subject of speculation, both to philosophers and politicians, to find the motive on which the same gentlemen, who were so zealous to deprive the clergy of a *temporal* privilege, should be as earnest in confining them to a practice, which is understood to occasion some degree of *prevarication* among them. Human laws cannot always be so strictly worded, as not to leave room for evasion; I have been informed that the intended bill was as liable to this imperfection, as some other acts respecting the clergy, have been before it. Could these gentlemen expect, that a sort of men would strictly adhere to the plain sense of *one* law, which affected their property so materially, who are supposed so frequently to em-

ploy their dexterity in quibbling away the plain sense of *another*.

This imputation, therefore, must be taken, only as an adjunct of that foolish calumny, which ascribes to the petitioners a design to ruin the church of England. But as I am persuaded that neither the petition, nor the limiting bill had any such design, or would have had any such effect, I shall be free to confess, that, had I been one of the petitioners, I should not have thought of opposing a bill of this nature, provided the limitations in it were extended to every order in the church, and to every body of men incorporated for ecclesiastical purposes.

In the various conversations I have heard upon this subject, I could never find more than two allegations against it, which deserved the least notice.

The first went upon the supposition, that "all donations to, and endowments of church-"es, had the sanction of a kind of *consecrati-*"*on*, and that even the municipal law of our "own country had annexed the idea of *sacri-*"*lege* to the subtraction of them by the laity.*

* Tithes are called, *a spiritual fee*; and Hobart, Rep. 42, says, "that which is given in lieu of tithes, is *turned* into *a spiritual fee*." —"In these latter ages," (says Godolphin, 349) "not regarding "what St. Hierom says, that *fraudare ecclesiam est sacrilegium*, "all artifices imaginable are put in practice to subduct the tithes, and "therefore to enforce the due payment thereof, were the Statutes of "Hen. 8, and Ed. 6, made and enacted." And this doctrine is taken up by the author of Ornaments of churches considered, Pref. p. ix. "By private persons benefactions are often made to churches, "which, whatever they consist of, are consigned to the care and "custody of the churchwardens, and without any previous licence an "unalienable and sacred right is hence conveyed."

" —That the withholding or secreting such " donations, &c. for a number of years, was " rather an aggravation of the sin, than a di- " minution of the incumbent's title to them. " —That, therefore, the legislature would not " only be unreasonable, but irreligious, in " shutting this door upon the clergy, and de- " priving them of the means of recovering " what the iniquity of former or latter times " may have disposed the malefidious possessors " to conceal or detain."

I dare say I shall be allowed by every one who knew the late Archbishop of Canterbury, to suppose, there is not a man in the three king- doms more likely to urge this argument in favour of the church, than he would have been in case this bill had been brought into parlia- ment in his life-time. And, therefore, with- out discussing the point either on theological or legal principles, I shall only appeal to his Grace's authority in a work, which we must, in common charity, believe to contain his last and latest sentiments upon the subject.

"The fact" says his Grace, "is notorious, " that all our temporal powers and privileges " are merely concessions of the state."*

If the powers and privileges of bishops are upon this footing with the state, much more, surely, are the temporalities of the inferior

* Letter to Mr. Walpole, p. 10. But Coke and Selden had discovered this secret before him; and we see in the note above, that the *jus divinum* would not do, without the *jus humanum*. After all, it is no more than what Cardinal Fleury allows, even with respect to the temporalities of the Popedom. See Jortin's Rem. Eccl. Hist, vol. v. p. 290.

clergy. And it is to be noted, that as his Grace allows, that, if it so pleased the state, "bishops might be both without *peerages* and "*consistory courts*," there must be a competency in the legislature to judge when, where, and in what manner it may be expedient to augment, withdraw, or modify these concessions from time to time, as the exigencies of the public may require.*

It is upon this principle, I apprehend, that the petitioners offered their grievance to the consideration of the honourable house of Commons in the first place. Here sit their representatives, and here, as they are freeholders of Great Britain, the conditions on which they hold their freeholds, are more immediately cognisable. Subscription to the thirty-nine articles, &c. is *one* such condition; and they must have deserted both their principle and their cause, had they opposed Mr. Seymour's Limitation-bill, upon the allegation of a *divine right* to their temporal possessions.

Orthodox churchmen, whatever concessions they may make in any present distress, have always shewn the utmost reluctance to have their ecclesiastical claims canvassed in parliament, and particularly in the house of Commons. And accordingly, though they did not think proper to call in question, the principle

* "Nothing has loſt the Pope ſo much in his ſupremacy, as not "acknowledging what Princes gave him. 'Tis a ſcorn upon the "civil power, and an unthankfulneſs in the prieſt. But the church "runs to *jus divinum*, leſt if they ſhould acknowledge what they "have by poſitive law, it might as well be taken from them, as "given to them." Selden's Table-talk. Tit. Jus Divinum.

upon which I have supposed the petitioners to conduct themselves, they found the means to attack them upon other pretences, first upon the illegality, and secondly, upon the impropriety of the mode of their application.

With respect to the first pretence, it was reported, that their lordships had procured an opinion from one or more sages of the law; that, by presenting a petition of this nature to the house of Commons in the *first* instance, the petitioners had incurred a *premunire*, such application being derogatory to the king's *supremacy* in all causes ecclesiastical.*

* There is some reason to believe, that this is a mistake, and that if any opinion was given, it was certainly in favour of the petitioners. Mr. Verelst, it seems, has said, that "Lawyers, like priests of old, "will judge of the duties of men by the interests of their own order; "and the oppressed subject will feel the institution of a burthen, "without reaping the smallest advantage." See the Monthly Review for February, 1773, p. 85. It is not very material how this sententious maxim is applied by the ingenious author. Modern lawyers are very little interested in framing burthensome and unprofitable institutions for the purpose of oppressing the people; nor indeed is it easy to see why modern priests should be thus complimented at the expence of modern lawyers. The petitioners, I am sure, have no reason to assent to the insinuation. They are oppressed by a burthensome institution, from which not the smallest advantage is reaped by the public. It was laid upon them by priests of old, and is certainly not continued upon them by modern lawyers. One should never deal in that sort of wisdom which is only to be justified by a *few* of her children. The petitioners are smarting under the rigour of the facerdotal order, which, as they learn from the writings of their adversaries, hath an *interest* in continuing the oppression. It is possible too, that they might find instances of corrupt lawyers in ancient history. They would however be highly blameable, should they, *on these accounts*, convert Mr. Verelst's proposition, by ma-

Permit me to ask, would this opinion have been solicited, would it have been given, if the petitioners had applied to the bishops in the first place? Was not every anti-petitioning mouth opened against them, for thus passing by their proper superiors; and did not the bishops themselves highly resent this affront? I would ask then, what circumstance brought the petitioners within the peril of a *premunire*, by applying to the house of Commons, which would not have exposed them to the same peril, had they petitioned the bishops only? The words, in the Act, 16. Rich. II. *shall pursue any process in the court of Rome, or elsewhere*, are, I am informed, the ground of the opinion given on this occasion. Does not the word, *elsewhere*, include the body of the bishops, whether in or out of convocation, as well as the house of Commons?

Dr. Wood tells us, "By the word *elsewhere*, "it is said, that suits in *equity*, to relieve "against a judgment at law, and suits in the "*Admiralty*, suits in the court of the *Constable* and *Marshal*, and in the ecclesiastical "courts, for matters belonging to the cognizance of the common law, are within the "statute."* To this, indeed, he puts a *quære*,

king the *lawyers* and *priests* change places. There are numbers of lawyers who are not interested in the sort of oppression Mr. Verelst complains of: and there are, I trust, numbers of priests, who are not accessaries to that sort of it which incommodes the petitioners, nor think they have the smallest advantage in the continuance of it.

* Wood, B, iii. c. 3. His *quære* refers us to 4 Hen. IV. c. 23. (it is the 22d on the roll) which is little to the purpose, and is only the amendment of another act, which confined the incumbent wrong-

though he cites for his authority Coke's institutes. Be it observed, however, that suits in parliament are not comprehended in this list. On the other hand, when we consider, that the statute of Rich. II. was aimed at the Pope's encroachments on the royal supremacy, and that bishops were the *spiritual* heirs of his pretensions, it will readily occur, that, on this very account, the word, *elsewhere*, must have had a more especial respect to them, whether sitting in their *courts*, or in their *conclaves*: and whoever he was that gave the opinion, concerning the first application of the petitioners to the house of Commons, needed not to have gone so far about, (as he must have done in that case) to bring them within the statute, had they begun with petitioning the bishops.

And now we are upon this subject, let us proceed a little farther. How would the king's supremacy be affected by this application to the house of Commons? *We give not to our Prince*, says the 37th article, *the ministring either of God's word, or of the sacraments.* What is the meaning of this *restrictive* clause? Is it merely that the Prince shall not preach a sermon, or

fully ousted, to bring his suit within the year, 13 Rich. II. c. 1. Whereas this law of King Henry gives the incumbent liberty to sue for his remedy, and to begin his suit, at what time shall please him, within the year, or after, at his will. But supposing the case cognisable at common law, it would still be on the peril of a *Premunire*, if he instituted his suit in the ecclesiastical court, any thing in this statute to the contrary notwithstanding.

read a chapter in the bible to his people? Does it not seem to lay some restraints upon such of his edicts as may relate to the ministring of God's word, by interfering with the mode of such ministring prescribed by law? If it does, a mere act of the royal supremacy could not, according to this article, have relieved the petitioners. If it does not, it takes from the Prince a privilege, which the laws allow to the very meanest of his people. In either case, how will the hierarchy excuse King James I. for preaching his long sermons to his parliaments, or his giving directions to other preachers, concerning the expounding any texts of scripture whatsoever?

But this is not all. Expound the clause of the article either way, and try if you can make it consistent with the *royal supremacy* as stated by the common law, which gives our kings *sacerdotal* powers without any such restriction.

"The King of England," says Godolphin, "is *Persona sacra, et mixta cum sacerdote*, and "at his coronation, by a solemn *consecration* "and *unction*, becomes a spiritual person, *sa-* "*cred* and *ecclesiastical*, and then hath, *tam* "*Vestam Dalmaticam*, as an emblem of royal "priesthood, *quam Coronam Regni*, in respect "of the regal power in temporals."*

* *Repert. Canon.* p. 9. And now the bishoprick of Winchester falling void, the king sends presently.—And because he will not be denied, he goes thither himself in person, and thus enters the chapter house as a bishop or prior, gets up into the president's chair, begins a sermon, and takes his text, &c. Baker's Chronicle, Hen. III. p. 82. See likewise Foller's Examination of the Scheme of Church Power. p. 32.

By this account, our Prince is invested with all *sacerdotal*, as well as *regal* power, without exception, and consequently with the power of ministring of God's word, and of the sacraments.* Nor will any greater difficulty arise

* Nothing is more amusing to a reader of History, than to observe the various sentiments and reflections of able and eminent men on the same sort of incidents. Parker, (the *Bayes* of the *Rehearsal Transprosed*) had said, that the King (Charles II.) "might, if he "pleased, reserve the priesthood, and the exercise of it to himself." On which Andrew Marvel, with his usual pleasantry, thus remarks; "Now this indeed is surprising; but this only troubles me, how his "Majesty would look in all the sacerdotal habiliments, and (*read*, "of) the Pontifical Wardrobe. I am afraid the king would find "himself incommoded with all that furniture upon his back, and "would scarce reconcile himself to wear even the lawn-sleeves and "the surplice. But what? even Charles the fifth, as I have read, "was, at his inauguration by the Pope, content to be vested, accor- "ding to the Roman ceremonial, in the habit of a deacon. And a "man would not scruple too much the formality of the dress in order "to Empire. But one thing I doubt, Mr. Bayes did not well "consider; that if the King may discharge the function of the "priesthood, he may too, (and its all the reason in the world) assume "the revenue. It would be the best subsidy that ever was volun- "tarily given by the clergy." *Rehearsal Transprosed*, p. i. iii. On the other hand, Lord Bolingbroke, on occasion of his being present at a solemn mass, celebrated by the Archbishop of Paris, wondered the King of France would commit the ministration of so august and magnificent a ceremony to a subject, and not perform it himself. "Le Czar PIERRE LE GRAND avoit supprimé la dignité de Pa- "triarche, et il en faisoit les fonctions." *Magasin Francois*, tom. 1. p. 271. One of these functions was, that in a certain annual procession, the Patriarch obliged the Czar to walk before him, holding the bridle of the patriarchal steed in his hand. "Ceremonie," says the historian, "dont un homme tel que Pierre le grand, s'etoit d'bord "dispense." This was going beyond the functions of the Archbishop of Paris, otherwise Lewis xiv might have had no scruple in changing places with his Patriarch. But *grand* as he was, he was too much a bigot to *usurp* the functions of the priesthood in a solemn pontifical mass. The Czar, it seems, was more of a heretic.

from the *mixta persona* in his Majesty, with respect to the two provinces of *king* and *priest*, than from the mixture of a *spiritual* function with a *temporal* peerage in the person of a bishop.

It is hardly to be supposed, that an article which was framed so long after these *new prescriptive* rites of *consecration* and *investiture* were instituted, should supersede the powers conferred by those solemnities; and therefore, if his Majesty's supremacy must be brought into the debate, let it be considered, whether they who would give up the article, or they who so pertinaciously adhere to it, are more in danger of a *premunire*.

As the law now stands, it is acknowledged on all hands, that these thirty-nine articles cannot be set aside but by the legislature. Some people indeed, have been wild enough to hold (upon the authority however of a famous lawyer) that even the legislature can make no alteration in our ecclesiastical constitution, without infringing the act of union; a doctrine too absurd even for the author of the book of *Alliance* to digest.

To petition or appeal to the legislature, then, is to petition or appeal to the king in his parliament, the only method in which the petitioners could expect relief from his Majesty in the present case; nor indeed do they seem to have been unmindful of his Majesty's peculiar province in an application of this nature; for though they begin with supplicating the commons, there is, in the prayer of their petition, an appeal to his Majesty's piety, with full as

much dutiful respect, I apprehend, as they would have shewn, in appealing to the royal supremacy, without noticing the parliament.*

But to leave this tender point, as Godolphin calls it,† (a *point* which ought to be full as *tender* to a bishop as a petitioner) and to consider the objection of an immediate application to the house of Commons, on the subject of this petition, taken from the supposed impropriety of it.

This impropriety, it seems, was alledged to consist, in applying for relief to a body of men, who were not supposed to be competent judges

* Though notice is here taken only of the objection made to the legality of the mode of application, yet the clamour was not less frequent or audible against the legality of the subject of the application, that is to say, against the contents of the petition, as *contrary* to *law*. When truth and reason procure a hearing in such times as these in public assemblies, it is oftentimes by some unforeseen circumstance, arising from the attempts of those, whose great concern it is to support the present system at all events. A piece of history, transcribed from the London Chronicle, March 11, 1773, may serve as an illustration of the force of the argument, and at the same time as an instance of the sagacity of those who urged it in a place, where only it could receive a proper and effectual rebuke. "Sir W———m "B——t having said, that the petitioners' (against the dissenters' bill, then depending) "thought perhaps counsel necessary to shew "many parts of the bill to be contrary to *law*.—Mr. *Gray*, Sir *Wil-* "*liam Meredith*, and others replied, that they hoped no counsel "would be suffered to teach the Commons of England, from their "own bar, the laws of their country. *We*, said they, *who are the* "*legislators and guardians of the laws to be instructed by counsel*, "*whether a bill we are about to pass into a law, be or be not con-* "*trary or agreeable to the laws and liberties of our country! This*, "said they, *would indeed be a censure upon the representatives of* "*the people, too gross not to incur the contempt of the public, too* "*shameful to be permitted*." With this opinion the Speaker heartily concurred."

† *Godolphin*, u. s. p. 11.

of a grievance, the nature of which could not be thoroughly understood, without an accurate knowledge in the deepest points of theology.

How the honourable Commons come by their learning, I presume not to know. But this I can safely affirm as a matter of fact, that if there was any want of knowledge in the debate on the 6th of February, it was not among the advocates of the petition. Those worthy persons could not have understood the question better, had they studied the controversy for twice seven years.* The question indeed was a very plain one, *viz.* Whether the *same men* who solemnly engage on their entrance into the

* Perhaps this may not easily be credited by those who have seen no more of the debate than appeared in the Newspapers, in which great caution was used to give no more of the speeches in favour of the petition, than was just necessary to illustrate the laboured answers of its opponents, most of which were inserted at full length. This was, no doubt, contrived on the charitable consideration, that the eyes of the people who had so long sat in darkness, should not be too suddenly incommoded with the full glare of light, which might have broke in upon them by an impartial exhibition of the replies to those answers. To the same sort of *prudential, benevolent*, and perhaps *pastoral* management, we may ascribe the pains that have been taken to bring forward every thing which might set the petitioners in an invidious light, and to keep back every thing which tended to qualify these impressions by more equitable representations. These little arts, however, seem now to be losing their influence, and consequently their use. The people are becoming more and more inquisitive in the merits of the cause. They begin to perceive that they themselves have an important interest in the event, as well as the clergy. The serious part of them see it is no matter of indifference, that their teachers should be free from every engagement, which may throw an imputation, or even the remotest suspicion upon their sincerity. And as this knowledge gradually gains ground, we may hope the tricks and sophistries that have been instrumental in suppressing it, will now be detected, and the authors of them held in no higher estimation than such practices intitle them to.

ministry, to teach the people from *the pure word of God only*, could, *on the very same occasion*, be *reasonably* required to teach *the same people* according to a system which is *not* the pure word of God *only?* For, be it remarked, with all due deference to the influential conductor of the antipetitioning cause, he himself declined the task of adjusting the articles to a consonancy with the scriptures; in which he shewed the good sense of a skilful divine, as well as the circumspection of a prudent statesman.

Where the ingenious gentlemen on the other side learned their language, might perhaps be an amusing inquiry. We have observed already, that *all* of them did not strictly adhere to the sentiments of my lords the bishops, either in their premises, or in the inferences they grounded upon them. And they who appeared to stick more to their brief, acquitted themselves with so little candour towards the petitioners, that these supplicants could hardly feel any remorse for not applying to the bishops in the *first* instance.* For surely the contempt

* The experiment however, has now been made, by the Rev. Mr. Wollaston, and his respectable associates, who thought, it seems, the petitioners at the *Feathers* wanting in due respect to their ecclesiastical superiors; and in this they surely were not mistaken, if the petitioners had any reason to believe, that their application would meet with better success than that of Mr. W. and his friends. Mr. Wollaston, in his very sensible tract on the subject, published previous to the meeting at Archbishop Tennison's library, represented a reformation of our church forms as a matter of such importance (not to say, necessity) that it was concluded, by some (who perhaps, foreboded to themselves the event) that he would not rest satisfied with an answer which implied, either an aversion to *any* reformation, or

and abuse thrown upon the petitioners, could hardly be justified by barely asserting, that *no*

a disapprobation of *any* application for it, but would adopt some other plan, which might promise a more successful issue. It was accordingly asked, if I remember right, in one of the Newspapers, what he and his friends would do, in case they met with an absolute negative? To this, as far as I know, no answer was given on the part of Mr. W. Nor perhaps was it necessary. Every man will think he has a right to act in such cases, as he sees cause, and if he thinks proper to risque his estimation with the world upon his acquiescence in the political discretion of his superiors, after he has unanswerably shewn how little political discretion has to do with the cause he espouses, he will not think himself compellable to answer for consequences at the bar of the public. But may I with all due deference be permitted to suggest, that the case with that venerable body to whom the application was made, was widely different. They are public men, and that in a province which requires that they *should keep back nothing that is profitable* for the people committed to their care. Charges of impropriety or want of truth, either in our public professions of faith, or in our forms of worship, are no light matters. Tracts written upon such subjects, with that decency and good sense as that of Mr. Wollaston, and which are at the same time so intelligible to the common understandings of most men, make impressions which require all the weight and authority of the episcopal character to efface. Artificial or evasive accounts of such matters from inferior hands, such as those of Dr. Balguy, Dr. Tucker, and twenty more, are either absolutely unintelligible, or never touch the main question, in which the credit of the protestant religion is chiefly concerned; not to mention the disgust arising in ingenuous minds, from the abuse and misrepresentation with which the solicitors for reformation have been treated by these angry subalterns, who, the world would take it for granted, were not countenanced, much less employed by English bishops, whose praise it is and has been, since the accession of our Princes and the house of Hanover, to *let their moderation be known unto all men.* Their Lordships' sense of these matters, when delivered in visitation charges, is only useful to the clergy, who perhaps do not always faithfully report it. Pastoral letters, published and dispersed in their several dioceses, a method taken by some of their Lordships' predecessors with good effect, would signify their sentiments to their respective flocks, to the best advantage: christian charity as well as christian prudence seem to require something of this

alteration is necessary; in support of which aphorism, the dispensers of it seemed to be left by their clients to find reasons as they could.

I give this only as a conjectural account, why the petitioners did not follow the advice so often given them in Newspapers and pamphlets to commit their cause to the bishops. They might have others to which I am a stranger. But even bystanders could see and remark,

sort at their hands, that it may appear to those who have waited so long for some authentic information, either that no reformation is wanted, or that their Lordships are lamenting that they are fallen into *evil times* which will not admit of it. The common report is, that their Lordships' answer to this application was, "that in their "opinion, it is neither prudent nor safe to do any thing in the mat-"ter submitted by those who made it, to their consideration." Matters of *opinion* rarely give any satisfaction, except the reasons and grounds of the opinion are clearly and explicitly exhibited. The gentlemen who applied to the bishops, saw not in what respect it was either imprudent or unsafe to do something in the matter submitted to their consideration; nor, probably, do they see it yet. I should rather imagine they thought it neither prudent nor safe to do nothing in a matter of that especial importance for which they solicited their Lordships' interposition. And their reasons for so thinking are not obscurely set forth, in the excellent little tract above-mentioned. These reasons should have been particularly opposed by their Lordships' reasons, for the information of the public, which is yet to seek, why in a free government, it should neither be *prudent* nor *safe* to reform what is evidently amiss in their public forms of religion. If nothing is amiss, it should be so said, and so proved. In the mean time, it is not said *in whom* it would be *imprudent*, or *for whom* it would be *unsafe* to do any thing, &c. Had it been said, "It would "be neither prudent nor safe *for us* to do any thing, &c." the solicitors would have understood that they were left at liberty to apply to some other consequential body in the state, for whom it would be neither imprudent nor unsafe, to do *something*. But I forbear to pursue the reflections that might be made upon *oracular* responses of this kind; my intention is only to vindicate the petitioners of the Feathers-association for not beginning their application where they had good reason to believe they should have no satisfaction.

from the profound silence of their lordships during so many months as elapsed from the first meeting at the *Feathers* tavern, to the day of hearing in February, that the petitioners had little or nothing to expect from that quarter; and even bystanders came to know, that in that interval, some individuals had applied to their respective diocesans for their sentiments on the subject, without the least satisfaction or effect.

These things being considered and laid together, it will clearly appear to the intelligent reader, that as the petitioners were perfectly right in making their first application to the house of Commons, so they would have been perfectly wrong and inconsistent with their own pretensions, had they raised, or joined in any opposition to the bill for *limiting the claims of the clergy*, either in their *civil* or *ecclesiastical* capacity.

In the other objection to Mr. Seymour's limiting bill, the petitioners are very little, if at all concerned; certainly no farther, than they may wish our gracious Sovereign may reign undisturbed by any misunderstanding with any class of his people.

The objection was, that "the bill proposed, "had a tendency to *embroil* the crown with "the church."

As I was not present at this debate, I take this particular from common report, which adds, that this probable effect of the law in question, was suggested by one of those who affect to distinguish themselves from some

others of his Majesty's *equally loving* subjects, by the title of, *Friends to the Crown.*

I should have thought, that a *real* friend to the crown would have been cautious how he dropped an apprehension of that sort in the company where it was said to be delivered. Where there is a legislature to interpose between the crown and *any* body of men who are disposed to quarrel with it, the crown should have little to fear from the discontents of the church, unless there should be some secret article in the *alliance* between the crown and the church, to which the people and their representatives in parliament are no parties. If the crown and the church have their uses for each other, distinct from the interests and welfare of the public, and out of the cognisance of its constitutional guardians, it may be a point of prerogative wisdom to avoid a breach with the church. And does not *this* objection to the limiting bill seem to imply a connection of that nature? And would it not intimate to the audience, that the *less ostensible* articles of the *alliance* might be *inimical* to the rights and liberties of a free people?

The patrons of the *limiting bill*, it is possible, might perceive something in the *visible* effects of such alliance, detrimental to the community at large, and not very honourable to the crown. *Commendams*, *Dispensations*, *Pluralities*, to which the crown either directly or ministerially gives its sanction, have been known to scandalize some honest men, who think they ought to be edified by the *moderation* of pious bishops, and the *simplicity* of conscientious

presbyters, not to mention the murmurs of those who are obliged, through these indulgences, to pay for entertainment they never taste. The patrons of this bill could not be ignorant, of what nineteen in twenty of their constituents are well aware, that is to say, of an immense increase of property daily accruing to the church, which is likely enough, without a timely interposition of the legislature, to render the church paramount to every other *societety* in the kingdom, and even to the crown itself. All the world knows by this time, that the church is mistress of an accumulating fund, which, in a course of years (perhaps not much longer than that which has run out since Harry the eighth's resumptions) will, upon a fair and moderate calculation, enable her to purchase an estate more than equivalent to that, which was, at that period, alienated from her; and all this by the *bounty* of the crown.

Surely it behoves, that the church should do the crown some very essential service in return for these generous benefactions. Our Monarchs have been, in most periods, wary enough not to dispense their favours, particularly of the pecuniary kind, without some valuable considerations. But what the *service* expected from the church may be in grateful return for this kindness, would be hard to say, unless we may be allowed to conjecture, that the Rev. Dr. Nowell was her spokesman on the thirtieth day of January, 1772. And that being presupposed, we can hardly wonder that thanks for his performance were discovered *ex post facto*, to have been misplaced, and that he should be re-

ferred to those who had greater obligations to him, to comfort him for his disappointment.

As this discovery was made after the petition for relief in the matter of subscription was rejected, I could not help musing a little on the very different impressions the same subject, considered in different lights, will make, sometimes within a very few days, upon the same audience.

It is probable Dr. Nowell might, on this occasion, adopt his doctrine more immediately from a certain decree of the university in which he enjoys an *honourable distinction*. Nevertheless, had he been heard by his counsel, a very indifferent advocate might have shewn, that the doctor's inferences are strictly deducible from the doctrine of our homilies against *rebellion*, which are appointed to be read on every solemn commemoration of the *martyrdom*, and to which every clerk, and every graduate, is obliged to subscribe his unfeigned assent and consent, as *agreeable* to the word of God.

I apprehend the gentlemen who stigmatized the petitioners as disturbers of the public peace and fomenters of controversy, were not a little interested to keep the doctor and his principles in credit. Why did they not exert themselves to screen the preacher from a disgrace, which, by falling upon him, fell unavoidably at the same time upon the *thirty-fifth* article of the church of England? Why should the petitioners be deemed *mad* and *frantic*, for attempting to remove those articles, whose doctrine, in a most important point, Dr. Nowell was deemed *mad* and *frantic* for espousing?

I freely own, that, in my poor opinion, the continuing so general a subscription to these Homilies, is no great act of friendship to the crown, or to the gracious head which wears it; especially considering the law by which it is there placed. Prevarication in a point of that national concern, has but an untoward aspect upon the allegiance which the same subscribers are obliged to pledge to the present royal family. The laity honestly insure their fidelity to his Majesty, by a plain oath without any reserve or drawback. Can a clerical subscription to a doctrine which implies, that the revolution of 1688, was neither *rightful* nor *lawful*, serve to any other purpose, when contrasted with the oath of abjuration, than to hint to the public, the convenience of leaving open a door of retreat for the *clerical society*, in case the crown should come to circumstances of embroilment with the church? And ought the petitioners to become obnoxious to any friend of the crown for endeavouring to shut the door against a pretence of that kind?

There was another matter, canvassed with no little warmth among our political guardians since the fate of the Petition, which does no discredit to the cause of the Petitioners.

Order and *good government* seem to a plain understanding to require, that where there is a system of religion (so called) adopted by the magistrate for the practical uses of his people, care should be taken, that there be no contradiction or disagreement between the established civil policy, and the doctrines of that system. This has, I hope, sufficiently appeared from

the case stated in the instance just mentioned: and it will be no less apparent from that I am going to give.

Were I disposed to give any opinion concerning the late law which lays a restraint upon the Royal Family with respect to their marriages, I should not perhaps condemn it with that severity which some writers have expressed. A law of that sort may, for ought I know, be highly expedient for the public. But surely, before it was finally enacted, some course should have been taken with the *thirty-second* of our Articles of Religion, which most expressly teaches, that, " It is lawful for ALL " CHRISTIAN MEN to marry *at their own dis-* " *cretion*, as they shall judge the same to " serve better to godliness."

This *thirty-second* Article, or at least the last clause of it, should indeed have been disposed of near twenty years ago, before the *act to prevent clandestine marriages* took place. As things are now circumstanced among us, our confession allows us, as *Christian men*, i. e. subject to the laws of the Gospel, *to marry at our own discretion, as we shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.* But,

1. The law of the land says, " No; you " shall not marry at your own discretion, but " at the discretion of your parents or guar- " dians, on the peril of having your marriages " declared *null* and *void*, your issue *bastar-* " *dized*, and the succession of your posterity " defeated."

2. The Antipetitioners say, that the intent of requiring subscription of the clergy is, that

they may all preach the *uniform* doctrine of the articles. The law says, that, in the present instance at least, the judge upon the bench shall preach a doctrine contrary to that of the thirty-second article.——The article leaves the marriage of the *christian man to his own discretion; as he himself shall judge the same to serve better to godliness;* that is, the article leaves it to his *conscience.* Bút the law interferes, and says, that in certain cases (where however conscience is a very capable judge) the man's conscience has nothing to do in the matter with respect to the *godliness* or *ungodliness* of his views, but the conscience of his guardian, or of my Lord Chancellor.

3. The clergyman subscribes his *assent* and *consent* to the article as *agreeable to the word of God.* But if he acts according to the *doctrine* of the article, in the said cases, and celebrates a marriage approved and authorised by it, he shall be transported as a felon.

4. The petitioners are told, that their request cannot be complied with, as it would break in upon the *uniformity* of the *establishment.* If therefore subscription is still to be continued as a means of preserving *uniformity,* should not the latter part of this *thirty-second* article run thus? "It is not lawful for all christian men "to marry at their own discretion, or as they "themselves shall judge the same to serve bet- "ter to godliness, but shall govern themselves "herein at the discretion of a parent or a "guardian, as the parent or the guardian shall "judge the same to serve better to"——whatever he or she pleases to substitute in the room of *godliness.*

It does not appear (at least from any minutes I have seen of the debates on the occasion) that the authority of this article was expressly alledged in opposition to what is called the *Royal Marriage Act.* And yet this might have been expected from some of the episcopal bench, which, in general, is understood to maintain, that *all* and *every* of the *thirty-nine* articles are *agreeable to the word of God.*

This silence of their lordships is the more surprising, as the *doctrine* of the article is pretty strongly asserted in certain *remonstrances*, retailed in the public prints, as part of the proceedings of that illustrious assembly, of which their lordships are members.

" We conceive," says one of them, " the " right of conferring a discretionary power to " prohibit all marriages, (whether vested in " the crown alone,—or in the manner now " enacted by the bill) to be above the reach " of any legislature, as contrary to the origi- " nal inherent *rights* of *human nature*, which, " as they are not derived from, or held under " *civil laws*, by no *civil laws* can be taken " away."———To disable a man during his " whole life, from contracting marriage, or " what is tantamount, to make his power of " contracting such marriage, dependent, nei- " ther on his own choice, nor upon any fixed " rule of law, but on the arbitrary will of *any* " man, or set of men, is exceeding the power " permitted by the divine Providence to hu- " man legislatures. It is directly against the

" earliest command given by God to mankind,
" contrary to the right of domestic societyand
" comfort, and to the desire of lawful posterity,
" the first and best of the instincts plant-
" ed in us by the author of our nature, and
" utterly incompatible with all religion, na-
" tural and revealed, and therefore a mere act
" of power, having neither the nature nor ob-
" ligation of law."

Again, another of these remonstrances affirms, that " the liberty of marriage is a na-
" tural right inherent in mankind,—that this
" right is confirmed and inforced by the holy
" scriptures, which declare marriage to be of
" divine institution, and deny to none the
" benefit of that institutiou,—that the law of
" nature and divine institutions, are not re-
" versible by the power of human legislatures."

This language, I apprehend, is strictly conformable to the doctrine of the article, and is not to be confuted but by shewing, that human legislatures have the authority which is here denied them.

It is true, there are concessions in both these remonstrances, which may seem to favour the restrictions in the *act to prevent clandestine marriages*, but really do not. For though it may be true, that the legislature " has a
" power of prescribing rules to marriage, as
" well as every other species of contract," though it may be expedient, that *minors*
" should not marry without the consent of
" their parents or guardians," yet the general doctrine laid down before, will make these *al-*

lowances utterly insignificant to establish the validity of that law.

For who are *minors* with respect to a *capacity* for marriage? "None," say our good old laws, who have attained the age of *fourteen;*" and *minority* and *impuberty* are, with respect to marriage, synonymous terms, as may be seen in our law-books. Nature indeed, as well as experience, seems to have fixed this period to determine the *discretion* of a man, as well as his *other* capacities for marriage; for allowing the *impediments* laid down in our laws, to be perfectly consistent with the *natural* and *scriptural* rights of the *christian man*, what youth of *fourteen* years of age does not know, in what *degree* of *consanguinity* he is, or is not related to the woman he desires to marry? or whethether he is under a *precontract* to any other woman, and so of the rest, The *discretion* therefore, of the article, plainly means a competency of judgment with respect to the *essentials* of marriage, and is then sufficiently exercised, when the man's choice stands clear of these *impediments*. If you carry *discretion* with respect to marriage, to any other particular instances, I am afraid you will find as many who, if we judge by events, have *wanted discretion after* twenty-one, as have *wanted discretion before it.*

As then the natural rights of a man to contract matrimony, do by an almost universal consent of divine and human laws commence with his *fifteenth* year, or his age of *puberty*, upon what evidence are we to judge, that divine Providence has permitted human legislatures

to deprive the man of his choice, and to confine him for seven long years (which with respect to great numbers is confining them for life) to the arbitrary will of one man, who acts by no rule of law, and perhaps upon no better motives than those of *avarice* or *caprice*.

Though I have a strong prejudice in favour of every thing of this sort which appeals for its sanction to the word of God, rather than to the commandment of man, I do not know whether I should wish to be understood, that I give the preference to the article, or the protest, in comparison with these laws.* All I mean to say, whatever I may think, is, that there is a manifest disagreement between our *thirty-second* article of religion, and these two laws. Which of them is the *more excellent*, is a question rather for my lords the bishops, than for us, who having no *mixed* character, *must* follow the law at all events: and their silence on passing of both these laws (one dissenter excepted) cannot, I think, be otherwise accounted for, than by the supposition, that their lordships thought the *Article* and the *Laws* were perfectly reconcileable to each other.

* My old friend *Urban*, a most obsequious *devotee* to all political and ecclesiastical establishments, hath lately presented us with an *important* paper, containing a *Demonstration* of the *Truth* of the *Thirty-nine* Articles of religion, from *Scripture*. How he hath acquitted himself in *other* respects, let the Forest judge. I have only to remark, that, having the fear of *embroiling* the crown with the church before his eyes, when he comes to this *Thirty-second* Article, he is so far from *demonstrating* the *truth* of this last clause of it from scripture, that, with a *prudent reserve*, which would do honour to a Privy Counsellor, he does not chuse to *mention* even the *Contents* of it. See *The Gentleman's Magazine* for *April*, 1772. p. 160.

But should not their lordships have considered, that what may be clear to them, is not always so to their numerous flocks, the very meanest of whom has his claim of a *divine*, as well as a *natural* right to marriage, which the article seems to secure to him in a way that does not admit of the restriction laid upon him by the *Act to prevent clandestine marriages*. And as their lordships have thought proper to adhere to *all and every* of the thirty-nine articles, against the petitioners of February 6, would it not have become their charity to have explained to the public, by what sort of reasoning this article of our public *Confession of Faith* might be made to stand its ground, against this seeming contravention of a solemn Act of parliament?

We read in history, that, when the Duke of York had married the Earl of Clarendon's daughter, in the year 1661, "The King or-"dered some Bishops and Judges to peruse the "proofs the lady had to produce: and they "reported, that, according to *the doctrine of* "*the gospel*, and *the law of England*, it was a "good marriage; so it was not possible to break "it, but by trying how far the matter might "be carried against her for marrying a person "so near the king without his leave."* That is to say, how far the crime was a *capital* one, for *fine* or *imprisonment* would not have nullified the marriage.

Here was a clandestine marriage under every description of that offence, yet by a happy co-

* Burnet, Hift. O. T. fol. vol. 1. p. 168.

incidence of the *gospel* and *the law of England*, such as it was in those days, this was a marriage *it was not possible to break*, but by an arbitrary act of power, which even Charles II. would not venture to exert.*

For my part, I should not think the prelates of our times at all less competent to judge a matter of this nature, than the bishops of 1661. Would it not, therefore, have become them to have satisfied the people, (who are persuaded that the gospel is what it always was from the beginning) that the connection between the *law of England* and *the gospel*, still subsists unbroken, notwithstanding these late *limitations* of the *natural rights* of marriage?

I have sometimes amused myself with trying what I could do towards reconciling the thirty-second article of religion with the tenor of the Act of parliament, presuming, there might be no more difficulty in the attempt, than Father Sinclair found in trying to accommodate the first period of the said article with the decree of the council of Trent, which anathematized all who held the marriage of a priest to be va-

* "The Earl of *Leiceſter*, in the year 1579, privately married "the widow of *Walter Devereux*, Earl of *Eſſex*; of which Queen "*Elizabeth* being informed by Simier the Frenchman, ſhe was ſo "enraged, that ſhe commanded Leiceſter to confine himſelf to the "caſtle of Greenwich, and intended to ſend him to the tower, which "would have gratified a number of his enemies. But the Earl of "*Suſſex*, the chief and the moſt incenſed of them, diſſuaded her "Majeſty from it; his *good ſenſe* and his *noble and generous diſpo-* "*ſition of mind*, convinced him, that no man ought to be moleſted "on account of a lawful marriage, which had ever been univerſally "eſteemed an honeſt and honourable ſtate." *Camden.* But *tempora mutantur.*

lid *jure divino*, notwithstanding it was judged to be null and void, *jure ecclesiastico.**

But here a difficulty suggested by bishop Burnet made me despair of succeeding in my trials. "It may be justly doubted," says this good bishop, "whether the church can make a "law that shall restrain all the clergy in those "*natural rights*, in which Christ has left them "*free*. The adding a law upon this head, to "the laws of Christ, seems to assume an au-"thority that he has not given the church."† Now, the latter part of the article seeming to extend this *natural right* to *all christian men*, and another article having defined the church to be *a congregation of faithful men*, I could not be sure, but the *civil powers* might be comprehended, under this idea of *the visible church of Christ*, and consequently, prohibited to make any law to restrain this *natural right of christian men;* and I should certainly have

* *Expos. Paraphraſt.* ed. 3. octavo, p. 390. Sinclair, indeed, made but poor work of it on this article; and in the conſciouſneſs of his inefficiency, proceeds to expreſs his hope, that the church of England might in time be brought to approve the piety of Trent. *Quidni ſperemus*, ſays he, *morem illum antiquum et ſanctum* (confining the clergy to a vow of celibacy) *denuo obtenturum, dum memorias noſtras refricant, et publica illarum conſuetudinum et decretorum impreſſione recenti, animos piorum ad eandem ſanctimoniam pulſant.* This might be conſidered as a kind of prophetic hope, not very unlikely to be fulfilled, at the time Sinclair's book was publiſhed. Who can tell what future times may produce? To confine our youth to a ſeven years celibacy from their puberty, is no unhopeful way to inure them to the ſame reſtraint for the reſt of their lives.—N. B. The words, *refricant* and *pulſant*, are both in the quarto and octavo editions of Sinclar's work, but ſhould certainly be *refricat* and *pulſat*.

* *Burnet* on Art, 32.

concluded, there was no way of vindicating the law, but by dismissing these two articles, had I not luckily bethought me of the *fortieth*, which would authorise a subscription even to the institutions of a Pagan priesthood.

And yet, I know not how it comes to pass, the imposers of this supplemental article, do not always seem to be uniformly orthodox in explaining the doctrinal proposition it is understood to contain.

"We have certainly a right," says an eminent orator, "like every other society, to *ex-* "*act a compliance* with whatever doctrines, "ceremonies, and forms we establish, from "those who receive the public money for that "very purpose."*

* See the St. James's Chronicle, March 3, 1772. But in the late disputes concerning the hardship of paying tithes in kind, the beneficed clergy alledge, that they are not *stipendiaries*, but *proprietors*. So saith a writer who calls himself *Philoclerus*, in the London Evening Post, October 14, 1773; and so indeed, it should seem, the law determines. In an Exchequer bill the plea is, that the plaintiff is rector or vicar of such a parish, lawfully instituted and inducted, and as such hath a right to the tithe in question, not as a *stipendiary* for complying with established doctrines, ceremonies, and forms, but as a *proprietor*, whom the law hath invested with a freehold in the said tithe; and the single point in issue is, whether the tithe in dispute is parcel of his freehold or not. Mercy upon the clergy! if this gentleman's doctrine should take place. There would be no occasion for tithe-committees to relieve the farmer from the burthen of paying his tithes in any shape. It is but making himself master of the established rubrics, articles, and canons, and comparing his parson's *compliance* in practice with the established doctrines, ceremonies, and forms, and the farmer would quickly see, that the parson could not *legally* demand a single egg of him in the name of tithe. Nor would there be nine parishes out of the nine thousand, in which this would not be the case. It seems indeed as if, in *one* case, the clergy thought this exact compliance absolutely indispensable, that is to say, when they are to perform the ceremony of *reading in*. If,

To be sure, the labourer is only *then* worthy of his hire, *when* he performs the work for which he is paid: but this is very little to the case in hand, unless they who are intrusted with the disposal of the public money, have a right to establish what doctrines, ceremonies, and forms of religion they please; a point of right which some people are disposed to question.*

on that occasion, the reader mistakes a single collect, or omits a single suffrage, as hath been sometimes the case, he finds himself obliged *to read over again:* and some canonists have advised the new incumbent, to write the two Greek words Φρόνημα σαρκος in the 9th article, in the common character, for the use of the person or persons who are to attest his exact compliance with the law in this particular case. But legal possession of the freehold, being secured by this exact compliance, the clergy seem to be very little apprehensive, that the *public money* can be withheld on account of their non-compliance, in the common course of their ministrations.

* "The power of the legislature is limited," says the celebrated *Junius*, "not only by the general rules of natural justice, and the "welfare of the community, but by the forms and principles of our "particular constitution." *Dedication* to his Letters, 1772, p. vi. "The *discretion* of an English Judge," says the same *Junius*, "is "not of *mere will and pleasure*,—it is not *arbitrary*,—It is not ca-"pricious.—But as a great lawyer [Coke] says, discretion, taken as "it ought to be, is, *discernere per legem, quid sit justum.* If it be "not directed by the right line of the law, it is a crooked cord, and "appeareth to be unlawful." p. 313 of vol. ii. See more on this subject, by Sir Joseph Jekyll. Peere Williams ii. 685. N.B. This doctrine takes in the *legislative*, as well as the *executive* authority. But the principles of *our particular church-constitution*, make *the law of God the only* foundation of a *right* to establish the doctrines, ceremonies, and forms of *our* religion, and consequently, the rule of legislative discretion. The droll mortal, who not long ago, entertained the public weekly with his jokes on what he called *patriotic paragraphs*, and the *Prefacer* to a spurious edition of Junius's Letters, will needs farther those letters upon the Orator above quoted. I apprehend the passages just cited, compared with that to which they refer, may afford a sufficient confutation of that surmise. But if any

"Had I possessed a vote," says the same speaker, "when the *Directory* was going to

doubt remain, let the whole argumentation of this speech be compared with the following strong expressions of Junius's sense of our *church-affairs*, and their *managers*. "An honest man, like the true reli-"gion, appeals to the understanding, or modestly confides in the in-"ternal evidence of his conscience. The impostor employs *force* "instead of *argument*," (i. e. exacts compliance) "*imposes silence* "*where he cannot convince*, and propagates his character by the "sword." *Letters*, Woodfall's edition. vol. ii. p. 131. Speaking of one Mr. Horne's "feasting with a rancorous rapture upon the "sordid catalogue of his friend's distresses," he adds, "Now let "him go back to his cloister, *the church is a proper retreat for him.* "*In his principles, he is already a bishop.*" *ib.* p. 195. Again, characterising himself under the signature of *Philo Junius*, "These "candid critics never remember any thing he [*Junius*] says in ho-"nour of our holy religion; though it is true, that one of his leading "arguments is made to rest *upon the internal evidence, which the* "*purest of all religions carries with it.* I quote his words, and "conclude from them, that he is a true and hearty christian, *in sub-*"*stance, not in ceremony*; though possibly he may not agree with "my Reverend Lords the bishops, or with the head of the church, "*that prayers are morality, or that kneeling is religion.*" *ib.* p. 245. Once more; "His Majesty's predecessors (excepting that "worthy family from which you, my Lord, are unquestionably de-"scended) had some generous qualities in their composition, with "vices, I confess, or frailties in abundance. They were kings or "gentlemen, not hypocrites or priests. They were at the head of "the church, but did not know the value of their office. They "said their prayers without ceremony, and had too little priestcraft "in their understanding, to reconcile the sanctimonious forms of reli-"gion, with the utter destruction of the morality of their people." p. 250. Can the man who penned these sentiments be supposed to be so utterly lost to all sense of consistency, as to deliver a speech in support of a human establishment, (professing, however, to be founded on *the purest of all religions*) fraught with arguments and topics, equally favourable to the establishment of Rome pagan or papal, of Constantinople, or even of the *Cape of Good Hope?* What English protestant would not weep to think that he should have an advocate of *Junius's* abilities and pretensions to integrity, who, after nobly asserting his *political* privileges with powers of reasoning and language, superior to all the masters of eloquence upon record, should, in a

" be established, I would have divided for the " *Common Prayer;* and had I lived when the " *Common Prayer* was re-established, I would " have voted for the *Directory.*" Upon what principle, dear Sir, would you have taken this ground?—Evidently, from what goes before, upon the principle of PUBLIC PEACE, and because he would defend every thing *already* established, from the Pope's *Viceroyship*, down to the Roman Augurs' *geese* and *chickens.*

But, hold a little ———. The gentleman does not chuse you should run away with this *glimpse* of his *real* principles: and therefore (most consistently to be sure with what had gone before), gives it as the *obvious* (read *ostensible*) reason of this conduct in the cases of the *Common Prayer* and the *Directory*, " that " they were not essentially different; neither " of them contained any thing contrary to the " scriptures, or that could shock a rational " christian. And the articles appeared to him " in the same light."

Was it well done? Was it like *Cassius*, to desert the *fortieth* article, the *solver* of all *scruples*, the *reconciler* of all *contradictions*, the *adjuster* of all *prevarications*, and to put

frothy declamation, calculated for the views of a minister he detests, and the understandings of a majority he despises, abandon all the forts of christian liberty, and deliver up a set of honest, conscientious, liberal-minded gentlemen and scholars, to the tyranny and insults of priestcraft and hypocrisy, from which he would have us to understand he has so successfully emancipated himself? Is that the way to give its proper value to *morality*, above the *sanctimonious forms* of religion? Impossible! To identify the writer and the speaker, is treason against virtue, morality, christianity, common sense, and human nature.

the issue upon the merits of the *thirty-nine ?* What must be done with the compliment paid him by Dr. H———x, as the decisive finisher of the whole controversy ? Will the orthodox be permitted to let it rest upon *his* bare assertion, that, " there is nothing in the thirty-" nine articles contrary to scripture ?"—If not, must not some of them, out of mere gratitude, be obliged to find *proofs* for it, and by that means be carried once more into the wild sea of theological controversy? And what apology will he make to the ingenious founder of this *fortieth* article, for remitting him to a mode of defence, for which he seems to be totally unprepared, and which even ministerial encouragement would I conjecture, hardly rouse him to undertake ?

" For my own part," says the gentleman, " I am no friend to innovations in religion, " when the people are not, in consequence of " some religious abuse, much aggrieved. That " was the case at the reformation, and then " would I have heartily concurred in the al-" teration at that time made, had I been a " member of this house."

But can we, can the gentleman himself be certain, that he would have concurred in the alterations made at that period? Were not the same arguments used by the *non-reformers* against the alterations *then*, that this orator applies to the present occasion ? *The disturbance* of *public peace*, the *danger* of *multiplying heresies*, and the *sufficient perfection* of the *doctrines*, *ceremonies*, and *forms* then *established ?* Is not the question *now*, whether both clergy

and people are not aggrieved by the subscriptions established? Is it no grievance to a conscientious people, that their ministers are brought under the disagreeable dilemma, either to withhold from them what they are *persuaded* is the *pure word of God*, or to fall under the reproach of having falsified their subscription?* Did the gentleman never hear the scripture quoted in contradiction to the doctrine of an article? Did he not hear it affirmed, that some of the articles were *contradictory to scripture*, and *shocking* to *rational christians?* Did not some of those who opposed the petition, *decline* the defence of the articles? And must we take an *ipse dixit* from an individual who cannot be supposed to have examined the articles by the scriptures, with more accuracy and precision, than has been done by a *Lord of the Treasury?* It is very unlikely that this *postulatum* should be surrendered to him without some little debate. I question whether Dr. Tucker himself would grant it, without the qualifying words, *in the main.* What then may be the consequence of settling at last on the *merits* of the articles? Too probably the revival of that *hydra of controversy*, which would put one of his coadjutors to so much expence for *opium* and *mandragora* to quell and stupify it.

I shall have the less to say concerning subscriptions *exacted* of students and graduates in

* *Observe*, the priest is required at his ordination to promise "to "teach nothing (as required of necessity to eternal salvation) but that "which he shall be PERSUADED may be concluded and proved by "the scripture."

our universities, as the propriety of them is universally given up in every department, but those where the most substantial reasons for abolishing them, appear from the plainest matters of fact.* Even the Dean of Gloucester

* This hath appeared since to be a groſs miſtake. A certain debate on February 23, 1773, in a certain aſſembly, hath given us to underſtand, that the wiſeſt men in the nation think on the ſubject of academical ſubſcriptions, juſt as the preſiding characters in the two Univerſities do; or rather perhaps as thoſe of *Oxford ſay* they do. For, to the great mortification of their reſpective patrons, the wiſdom of Cambridge is, on this point, ſomewhat different from the wiſdom of Oxford. The learned Doctor *Powell*, the oracle of Cambridge, on every queſtion concerning ſubſcription, hath thought it time enough for a young man to ſubſcribe his bare aſſent to the *preſumptive* truth of ſuch and ſuch credenda, (concerning which he is farther to be inſtructed) at the time of taking his firſt degree. But the Oxford Advocate thinks it not at all too early for the ſtripling to give this aſſent at his matriculation, and backs his ſentiment with the authority of the primitive church in her treatment of catechumens. See *Gent. Mag.* for *July* 1773, p. 309. The example of the church's dealings with the catechumeni may perhaps appear to thoſe who only conſult the records of eccleſiaſtical polity which are in print, totally apocryphal: There is however little doubt but the original canon is in the archives of Oxford. We are told farther, that "the two great ſeminaries of "learning, Oxford and Cambridge, were inſtituted for the inſtruc-"tion of youth in ſound learning, and the promotion of the national "eſtabliſhed religion of the country: and that, as religion ſhould "ever go hand in hand with learning, the youth at Oxford are taught "to ſubſcribe certain formularies, which is looked upon as an act "ſomewhat equivalent to that which goes under the denomination "of confirmation." *ibid.* p. 308. Now at the time theſe ſeminaries were inſtituted, popery was the national eſtabliſhed religion, and ſo far as this argument is ſound, theſe ſeminaries were inſtituted for the promotion of *that*. And the conſequence is, that the reformers, who cauſed another religion to be promoted in them, contravened the inſtitution much more outrageouſly, than they who would exempt youths of ſixteen from ſubſcribing to—they know not what. It is moreover to be obſerved, that what was ſound learning before the reformation, was not ſound learning after it took place. All this however is moſt dextrouſly accommodated, by oppoſing the *ſpirit*

sacrifices these subscriptions to *propriety and the reason of things*, though by that concession he gives no inconsiderable blow to his second *Postulatum*. Academical degrees are certainly *honourable*, though not so *lucrative distinctions*, as deanries or bishopricks. And as they are conferred *in ordine ad temporalia*, the gentlemen of *Oxford* have given us reasons, as good as the best of Dr. Tucker's, why these candidates for *offices* in the *clerical society*, should be bound to the *centre of union*, as firmly as they who are to enter upon present pay.*

The academical guardians of *Cambridge* indeed, appear to be in an odd situation. They seem to be sensible, *how good and joyful a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity*, and wish, no doubt, to exemplify the Psalmist's exhortation, by coming to a perfectly right understanding with their *Oxonian* kinsmen. But the difficulty is, how this league may be brought about with a perfect *saving* to the ho-

of the benefactors to these institutions, to their *real intentions*. *Ibidem*. It is cautiously enough said, that subscription at matriculation is only *somewhat* equivalent to *confirmation*: for if any credit is to be given to our rubrics and canons, instruction is to go *before* confirmation, and not (as in the case of subscription above-stated) to come *after it*. *Oxford* however, is now in full possession of this salutary discipline; and if she chuses to avail herself of the arguments and concessions of her advocates and patrons, she may make it more salutary still, by enjoining subscription to her famous Decree of July 21, 1683.

* See a complete collection of papers, which have been published in *Oxford*, on the subject of subscription to the thirty-nine Articles, &c. at Matriculation. *Leacroft*.

nour of both these learned bodies. The *Cambridge*-men, on the one hand, will not, I suppose, readily reprobate the wisdom of their predecessors out of mere compliment to *Oxford*. On the other hand, it may be depended upon, that *Oxford* will never shake hands with them, till they give her a reason, why subscriptions at matriculation are not required at *Cambridge*,*

* In the former edition, it was, *Why subscriptions at matriculation were abrogated:* but the writer has been since informed by a worthy friend, that, contrary to the common opinion, such subscriptions were never required at *Cambridge*. This circumstance may seem perhaps to some to detract from the comparative moderation of Cambridge, which, on account of this supposed abrogation, has had the praise of being more disposed to correct antiquated absurdities, than her rigid sister. A late effort to extend her moderation even beyond the period of matriculation, may possibly have reinstated her in the full reputation of a superior degree of candor and common sense. But I am afraid the matter upon examination, will not turn out so greatly in her favour as may be supposed. Heretofore subscription to the thirty nine Articles was required of Bachelors of Arts, as well as of candidates for superior degrees. Considering the studies in which the candidates for the first degree in Arts, are usually employed, this imposition had long been complained of as a reproach to a body, whose profession it was to teach the arts and sciences with all *liberality*. Narrow minded orthodoxy, equipped with a little brief authority, in whatever situation it acts, is loath to depart from its intrenchments; but being on this occasion forced out of them by the vigorous attacks of some generous spirits in the academic corps, its patrons had no choice, but to take refuge in some expedient which might afford them an equivalent for the security they were thus obliged to give up. That expedient consisted in substituting in the room of the articles, the following form: "I A. B. do declare that I am "*bonâ fide* a member of the church of England, as it is by law esta- "blished." This was called a *simple* declaration, and under that notion, passed, (though not absolutely without opposition from the more discerning members) into an academical *Shibboleth* by the common form of *Placeat vobis*. But however this succedaneum might please the majority, one of the young candidates to whom it was to be administred, reflecting with himself, on the multiplicity of

which may perfectly consist with the wisdom of *Oxford* in *exacting* them.

In the mean time the world is at gaze, how this affair, which hath created so much perplexity, to *all* true friends to subscriptions, will end. This test can hardly be continued in the Universities without some reflection on the wisdom of some of the most strenuous adversaries

the *laws* by which the church of England is eſtabliſhed, to many of which he was an utter ſtranger, and that the term *boná fide* implied, not only his acquaintance with them, but his perfect agreement in ſentiment with every thing eſtabliſhed by them, thought he could not with a ſafe conſcience *pledge his good faith* that he aſſented to ſo many particulars, of which he had no knowledge, nor could form any judgment. Accordingly, having paſſed the uſual examinations in his college and the public ſchools, he demurred to the ſubſcription; offering however a declaration, *that he was firmly perſuaded of the truth of the chriſtian religion, and was in actual communion with the church of England;* hoping this might anſwer all the ends propoſed by the impoſers of this new teſt: but orthodoxy, was, as uſual, inflexible, and therefore after conſidering the caſe in all views, he was contented to ſacrifice his degree, and whatever emoluments and advantages might ariſe from it, to the dictates of his conſcience, and the hope of enjoying in due time the peaceable fruits of his integrity. The whole caſe is ſet forth in the *Whitehall* Evening Poſt of *Auguſt*, the 12th. 1773, from which I have extracted theſe particulars, and is well worthy the conſideration of every parent who ſends his child to either of theſe famous ſeminaries, with a view of having him made an honeſt man and a good chriſtian, as well as a good ſcholar. What authority the Oxford-men have for injoining theſe ſtrange ſubſcriptions, I know not. The Britiſh parliament hath left them in poſſeſſion of it, whatever it is. It is better known whence the ſubſcription to the articles exacted of Bachelors of Arts took its riſe in the Univerſity of *Cambridge*, namely, from a *verbal* direction of King James I. given to the Vice-chancellor and heads of houſes at *Newmarket* in the year 1616, *which does not appear ever to have received the confirmation of a Grace.* Whitehall Evening Poſt, *June* 25, 1771.

of the late petition, who were candid enough to confess, that Academical subscriptions had no colour of reason to countenance them. On the other hand, it would not be decent to drop them without giving some reason;—*some reason*, perhaps, which the vigilant petitioners might hereafter find the means to turn to their own advantage.

It was lately my fortune to fall in company with an ancient, learned, and most worthy divine, who had formerly been chaplain to an eminent prelate, not long since deceased. He told me, he had carefully read all the arguments that had been offered, for excusing students and candidates for degrees in the Universities, from subscribing the thirty-nine articles; and he assured me, there were very few of them which would not equally conclude for excusing *nine* in every *ten* of those who had offered themselves for orders, during the time he had officiated as examiner on this occasion.*

* It is really difficult to conceive how so many of our worthy prelates, who seem, on many occasions, to want neither hearts nor heads, can without the utmost pain, bring themselves to administer this solemn test to so many poor creatures, who, they must have good reason to know, have very slender ideas of the contents of it. To excuse this on the footing of Dr. Powell's expedient, *viz.* that they may subscribe *on the authority of others*, is not quite so decent, in the case of those who are about to be sent out as teachers of religion, and might be liable to the repartee which was made to Pierce, bishop of Bath and Wells, by a poor man, whom the said bishop required to assent to the common prayer book, when the Bartholomew act took place. The man desired he might be permitted to read it, before he was compelled to assent to it. "You have already read "it," says the bishop, "by the mouth of the convocation, which is "your representative." *If that is the case*, replied the poor man, *let it suffice for me to assent to it by the mouth of the convocation.* It is, I own, beyond my skill to find out, on what other grounds this practice can be continued.

Perhaps the first extract in the following *Appendix*, may help the reader to conceive the probability of this account.

And to the reader I leave it, whether the conclusion of the *Collection* I have just referred to, may not be applied, with the fullest propriety, to the Tracts in favour of subscription, which have been aimed at the petitioners, without confining it to *Oxford or Cambridge*. Here it is.

"Such are the most material objections to "each particular hypothesis." [*viz.* upon which the *Oxford*-subscriptions are defended.] "A "presumption unfavourable to them all, it "must be acknowledged, arises from hence, "that in the place" [*read* kingdom] "where "this Test hath so long obtained, the very "persons who have required it, and who con-"tinue to patronize it, are not only *not agreed* "what *mode* of *defence* they may rely on, but "seem even at a loss *what interpretation* they "shall give to an act, whose *full and natural* "obligation they are afraid to avow."*

* I promised above to give some account in what sense Cranmer and Ridley wished their articles should be subscribed, which I cannot do better than by exhibiting the form they sent to Cambridge for that purpose. It was as follows:

Singuli Doctores et Bachallores Theologiæ, et singuli præterea Artium Doctores, solenniter et publicé ante creationem suam, hoc jurejurando sequenti se astringant, et in commentarios Academiæ ad it designatos, sui ipsorum manu referant. Quod ni fecerint, gradus sui capiendi repulsam patiantur.—"Ego N. N. Deo vere promitto "et spondeo, primo me veram Christi religionem omni animo com-"plexurum, *scripturæ authoritatem hominum judicio præpositu-"rum, regulam vitæ, et summam fidei, ex verbo Dei petiturum, "cætera quæ ex verbo Dei non probantur, pro humanis et non ne-*

" *ceſſariis habiturum.* Authoritatem regiam in hominibus ſum-
" mam, et externorum epiſcoporum juriſdictioni minimè ſubjectam,
" æſtimaturum, *et contrarias verbo Dei opiniones, omni voluntate*
" *et mente refutaturum: Vera confuetis, ſcripta non ſcriptis, in*
" *religionis cauſâ, antehabiturum.* Deinde me Articulos quibus
" in ſinodo Londenenſi Anno Domini 1553, ad tollendam opinio-
" num diſſenſionem, et conſenſum veræ religionis firmandum, inter
" Epiſcopos et alios eruditos viros convenerat, et regia authoritate in
" lucem editos, pro veris et certis habiturum, et omni in loco, tan-
" quam conſentientes cum verbo Dei, defenſurum, et contrarios ar-
" ticulos in ſcholis et pulpitis vel reſponden do vel concionando
" oppugnaturum. Hæc omnia in me recipio, Deoque Teſte, mè
" ſedulo facturum, promitto ac ſpondeo." The reader here ſees, that it is very immaterial in what particular ſenſe Cranmer and Ridley would have wiſhed Dr. Tucker to ſubſcribe the *doctrinal* propoſitions in their articles. If he anſwered their wiſhes, he muſt have ſubſcribed to the word of God in preference to all human compoſitions, and to all opinions eſtabliſhed only by cuſtom and tradition; under which laſt deſcriptions their articles are manifeſtly to be ranged. And yet, he muſt at the ſame time have ſubſcribed to theſe articles, as ſtanding upon a level with the word of God, and equally to be defended in the pulpit, and in the ſchools, with the ſcriptures themſelves: if we may not rather judge by the ſtrength of the expreſſion, that the ſubſcriber bound himſelf to be more ſtrenuous in oppoſing propoſitions contrary to the articles, than in oppoſing thoſe which ſhould be contrary to the written word of God. When men can be ſo inconſiſtent on the one hand, and ſo overbearing on the other, in impoſing their injunctions, it is of very little conſequence in what way they word their opinions. They cannot deſire that any one ſhould pretend to explain them; an *implicit* ſubſcription is all they want; and if Dr. Tucker did not ſubſcribe to ſo much of our preſent articles as was the manufacture of Cranmer and Ridley IMPLICITLY, he did not ſubſcribe as Cranmer and Ridley would have wiſhed.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

Extract from a Pamphlet, intitled, Advice from a Bishop, in a series of Letters to a Young Clergyman [his nephew]. Printed for M. Cooper, Paternoster Row, 1759. Letter ii. p. 17.

ADVICE.

—"WHETHER the subscription now "exacted at our admission into the church, and "which some of the clergy have considered "in the same light with the bigotted members "of the church of Rome, to be made accord-"ing to the sense of the compilers, and not as "articles of peace,—I say, whether this has not "a tendency to abate such a serious sense, in "those especially who consider it in that light, "and must *necessarily* therefore be guilty of "prevarication, I will not determine: but it "hath always appeared to me to be a point, "which deserves more consideration than I "could ever get bestowed upon it."

REMARK.

There is nothing to be made of this period, but that they who subscribe the articles in the sense of the compilers, must be like the members of the church of Rome, and consequently, *bigots*. And again, that subscription taken in this light, having a tendency to abate such a serious sense (I suppose as the sense of the compilers) must derive upon the subscriber the guilt of *prevarication*. How a man should be both a *bigot* and a *prevaricator* for subscribing the articles in the sense of the compilers of them, is difficult to conceive.

ADVICE.

" The church, we know, doth now not set " up for infallibility; and *in fact* doth not re- " quire any other subscription, than what is " necessary to peace and order: but then this " should be *publicly* and *explicitly declared*, " and not be left liable to any misapprehension " from weak and unthinking people, either " to their own offence, or the condemnation " of their brethren."

REMARK.

His Lordship is strangely mistaken, or something worse. The church, *in fact*, does require an *explicit* assent from the subscriber, far beyond what is necessary for peace and order, which, whatever the church may set up for, cannot, *de jure*, be required by any church

which doth *not* set up for infallibility. A public and explicit declaration of a contrary intention in the church of England, would be a declaration setting the *fact* and the *intention* utterly at variance, and tend to a proof, that the church hath no *real* authority to require such subscription, which, I apprehend, would be an inconvenience the church would think ten times greater than the *misapprehension* of weak unthinking people, or the *fierce contention* of subscribers, concerning original and literal senses.

ADVICE.

"There is no one pretends to deny, that the "first reformers from popery were obliged up- "on their own principles, to reject that au- "thority which the church of Rome had as- "sumed as its undoubted right; and that all "their proceedings should be warranted by the "express word of God."

REMARK.

The compilers could hardly think themselves *warranted* by the express word of God, to make articles of faith, which were *unwarranted* by the word of God. Either therefore, they deserted their own principles in making and imposing such articles, or if making and imposing the present articles, was consistent with their principles, the subscribers run no hazard

either of *bigotry* or *prevarication*, in subscribing them in the sense of the compilers.

ADVICE.

" Accordingly, when these articles, declaring the faith and doctrine of christianity, were drawn up for the clergy, they were drawn up with a view to distinguish themselves from those whom they had reformed upon; and by an act of the legislature, a subscription to them was made a qualification for orders in the church. The authority claimed by the church of Rome for establishing articles of faith, was of another nature, —pretended to be derived from God,—and made subscription almost as sacred and explicit as an oath.

REMARK.

No oath can be more *sacred* or more *explicit*, than the terms in which our present articles are subscribed. And therefore, however the contents of these articles might *distinguish* our reformers, from those whom they reformed upon, the authority by which they imposed them as articles of faith, was not *distinguishable* from the authority which they pretended to renounce. Both authorities were of the same nature, and both derived from the same source, and both exercised exclusively of the authority of the express word of God.

ADVICE.

" Our ancestors presumed on no such au-
" thority: they knew and owned themselves
" to be fallible: nay, they were so far from
" requiring an assent to human compositions,
" with the same strictness as to the word of
" God, that in one of the articles, it is ex-
" pressly declared, that what cannot be pro-
" ved by scripture, is not to be required of any
" man to be believed as an article of faith.
" Our reformers were sensible and honest men;
" but the age in which they lived, had no ex-
" traordinary light and knowledge in reli-
" gion."

REMARK.

All this proves only that the church of England's *professions* are inconsistent with her practice, in this matter of subscription. Whatever the sense and honesty of those who composed and injoined subscription to the articles at the first, might be, his lordship's mode of justification leaves us sufficient room to question, either the sense or the honesty of their successors, who pretend to more light and knowledge in the present age.

ADVICE.

" A considerable modern writer of the church
" of England," (I believe his Lordship meant the late Dr. Waterland) " hath been pleased
" indeed to discover, that the compilers of

" these articles were not able to express their " sentiments in apt and proper terms; be- " cause the very articles which they design- " ed as an explicit test against *Arminianism*, " are very capable," he said, " of an *Armi-* " *nian* sense. You would be surprised to find " this man of the first sense and learning, not " only attempting to prove, that the articles " are capable of an *Arminian* construction, but " also that in their most obvious and plain in- " terpretation, they do support that doctrine. " But the modesty of the gentleman is still " more conspicuous when he complains of the " *Unitarians* for subscribing the articles of the " Trinity. Because their subscription is to be " justified by the same way of reasoning; and " it would have puzzled him extremely, to " find an article to this plea, that the second " article in the natural import of the words, is " in favour of the Unitarian system, and di- " rectly levelled against the orthodox explica- " tion. But this by the way."

REMARK.

This instance serves only to shew, what ridiculous shifts men of learning are put to, when the honour and authority of the church are to be supported against truth, christian integrity, and common sense. Dr. Waterland, poor man, was only accounting for the *professions* and *conduct* of a large majority of his orthodox brethren.

ADVICE.

" At the time when these articles were first " compiled as a confession of faith in the " church of England, the greatest part, if not " all the clergy, were rigid Calvinists, and " they intended to declare in favour of the " doctrine which they believed. This was the " rise and design of these articles of religion; " we are now to consider their obligation. A " spiritual obligation, I have already told you " the reformers were obliged, upon their own " principles, to disavow. They discarded all " pretensions to infallibility, and they could " do no otherwise, or their separation from " Rome had been highly criminal. The legis- " lature afterwards ratified the articles, to dis- " tinguish, or to vindicate this separation from " popery, which had taught other doctrines; " and that they might exclude the men of that " religion from intruding into the church of " England, they required these articles to " be subscribed by all their clergy."

REMARK.

The facts in the former part of this paragraph, Dr. Tucker, as we have seen, strenuously denies, and we shall leave the bishop and his partizans to dispute it with him at their leisure. The obligation to subscribe, must be estimated by the authority which enjoins subscription. That authority must be a *spiritual* authority, if the first clause of the twentieth article be true. The disavowal of the reformers was,

I am afraid, *Protestatio contra factum.* However, taking the matter as his Lordship hath stated it, the compilers meant one thing, and the legislature another. The compilers intended to establish *calvinism* as *true religion;* the legislature only as a doctrine *distinct from that of the church of* Rome. The consequence is, that arminian subscribers go against the sense, not only of the compilers of the articles, but, in many points, against the sense of the legislature; a circumstance, no doubt, of great utility and edification.

ADVICE.

"The obligation, you see, therefore, is "merely of a civil nature, and the explana- "tion of the articles, from that time to this, "hath been various and uncertain. Different "interpretations of the same point of doctrine, "have been allowed and approved by the go- "vernors of our church, as orthodox, a lati- "tude hath been taken, and professedly, by "many of the greatest churchmen, in some "points; and ought therefore to be allowed "in others, as well as them. Compare the "writings of our clergy in both kingdoms, for "almost an hundred years past, with the arti- "cles, and see if you can find, that they tally "on the points which are commonly called "calvinistical. If not, the same rule of sub- "scription may be followed in all other cases, "which the highest churchmen have followed "in this, without blame, ever since the days "of Archbishop LAUD."

REMARK.

The obligation is no farther of a *civil* nature, than it binds to an assent to those articles which relate to civil government, namely, the king's supremacy, and the authority of the civil magistrate in general. Where a man declares his belief of religious doctrines, his *conscience* is or ought to be concerned; and under whatever obligation he lays himself by such declaration, it is most assuredly of a *spiritual* nature, by whatever authority it is injoined. And against that authority, no man who acknowledges it, can consistently plead a right of interpreting the established doctrines for himself, or plead his privilege, as a protestant, of appealing to the scriptures. As to what his lordship says, that different interpretations (that is, different from the original senses of the doctrines) have been, not only *allowed* but *approved* by the governors of the church as orthodox, I must in charity hope he is mistaken, and only means to answer for himself. For upon this supposition, there has been no standard of orthodoxy in the church of England from the early days of our reformation to the present times; and men of sense must think that we have had a strange set of church governors, who have for more than two hundred years, *allowed* and *approved* a practice in subscribing these articles, which the articles were established to *prevent*. And I am the rather inclined to think his lordship is mistaken, as he seems uncertain where to fix the rise of this *allowance* and *approbation*. Here he goes no higher for it than the days of

Archbishop *Laud;* but above, he dates it from the time the legislature *ratified* the articles, which however were never *ratified* by the legislature.

ADVICE.

" Indeed the affair of subscription is pretty " much the same with obsolete acts of parlia- " ment, which, though not formally repealed, " have lost their force. The legislature hath " not thought it proper to make any change in " the forms which were at first established for " an admission into the church, though it is " well known, that the sentiments of almost " all her members, in some points, are greatly " changed. For it is likewise known too, that " as words are only arbitrary signs of convey- " ing our ideas, so the same signs may be con- " tinued, though the thing signified be greatly " altered. Thus though there is no formal " repeal of the usual terms of subscription by " the legislature, in which the sole authority " we know is vested, yet the main end of such " subscription being attained, it indulges the " clergy with a liberty of affixing different ideas " to the same words, though foreign perhaps " from those which were originally designed."

REMARK.

If this is the case, why such opposition made to those who for their own security and satisfaction, desire a formal repeal of this affair of subscription? why are the men who solicit such

repeal branded as persons who want to *destroy* the church, merely because they are for taking away from her a test, already grown obsolete, of which she makes no use, or an use which is worse than none, an use which only serves to shew, that neither the church, nor her governors, have any fixed theological principles, and are as much at a loss for an uniformly orthodox confession of faith and doctrine as if they had no articles of religion at all. To say, "the same signs of conveying our ideas, may "continue, though the thing signified may be "greatly altered," is to say, the same signs may remain, though the thing signified be *not* signified. And this being the case of our articles, as his Lordship states it, what is the *end* attained by inforcing this subscription? It is impossible it should answer the end of a *test of any thing*, while the subscribers are *allowed* to give, and are *approved* in giving different and even opposite interpretations of the same propositions. I beg pardon, it is a test of the subscriber's ability to write his name.

ADVICE.

"The legislature may be assured, that there "never was, and I will venture to say, there "never will be, a subscription to all the arti- "cles, according to the plain sense and mea- "ning of the first compilers: and as it hath "never been declared, that such alone is the "subscription which is required, by depriving

" those whose public writings contradict this " original sense, it is evident, that a subscrip- " tion is allowed in any sense which is agree- " able to the word of God."

REMARK.

It is plain, however, that the intention of the legislature was, that the assent of the subscriber should be given to *all* and *every* of the articles, according to the plain sense and meaning of the first compilers; and it is no credit to the legislature to enact a law which never was, nor ever will be obeyed. As to what this bishop says, concerning what the legislature *allows* in lieu of obedience, I would humbly ask who is to judge of the *agreement* between the sense of the subscriber, and that of the word of God? If it is left to the subscriber himself to adjust this matter for himself, would it not be equally useful and much more edifying, for him to subscribe to the word of God at once, than to a systematical interpretation of it, upon which, after all, he may put his own interpretation too?

ADVICE.

" For he who subscribes the articles in a " sense equally consistent with the public " good, and the rights and properties of his " fellow-subjects, equally answers the inten- " tion of the legislature in the law which re- " quires any subscriptions; and, abstracted " from the force of the law, ecclesiastical im-

" positions in a protestant church, are imper-
" tinent and vain.

REMARK.

His lordship has told us before, that the obligation to subscribe is merely of a civil nature, and here he tells us, that to subscribe in *any sense* which is consistent with the public good, answers the intention of the legislature. But had his lordship been present at a certain debate, he would have learned, that the *public good* of subscription, has no connection with the *sense* the subscriber puts upon the articles, whether agreeable to the word of God or not. And, indeed, this seems likewise to be his lordship's own notion of the intention of the legislature, which, he says, has never deprived any one for contradicting in his public writings the plain sense and meaning of the first compilers. And if, as he farther says, "ecclesiastical im-
" positions in a protestant church" (by which he must mean imposing subscription, as of *spiritual obligation*, and consequently, a matter of *conscience*) "are, abstracted from the force
" of the law, impertinent and vain," one cannot conceive for what purpose he should speak of "any sense which is agreeable to the word
" of God," (as necessary to the *allowance* of a legal subscription) whose operation his lordship hath, in the present case, so effectually excluded.

ADVICE.

" Why a subscription to these articles is still " required in our church, though the senti- " ments of her clergy are so much altered, is " another question, I own, which it is natural " for you to ask, but which a wiser man than " I am, cannot answer.

REMARK.

This is honest and candid enough, and amounts to a confession, that his lordship has been soaping the Negro. I should now have asked the question, whether the rest of the venerable bench approve of these sentiments of their brother? but that I am just informed, we have all this while been fencing only with the shadow of a bishop, and that, *detractà pelle Leonis*, we are presented with the genuine figure of the Rev. Dr. Ferdinando Warner. Whether a real bishop would have sustained the character of a pastoral monitor with more address and precision, I presume not to inquire. It is certain, this *advice* has been more than once recommended to persons who expressed some doubts concerning this affair of subscription, as a piece of authentic casuistry. But we now turn from this advice from a personated bishop to a personated nephew, to the sentiments of a nephew addressed to a bishop, where the characters and kindred are somewhat better ascertained, so far as the public voice deserves our attention.

No. II.

Extracts from a pamphlet intitled, *A Letter to a Bishop, occasioned by a late Petition to Parliament for relief in the matter of Subscription.* London, printed for J. Wilkie St. Paul's Church-yard, 1772, with Remarks

LETTER.

"The petition aimed at more than moderate men could approve; it *tended* to the abolishing "of *all* tests, by representing *all* subscriptions "to be inconsistent with the fundamental prin- "ciples of a protestant church, as implying "an infallibility in the compilers of the forms "subscribed to, and consequently destroying "the indefeasible right of private judgment." p. 1, 2.

REMARK.

The omission of some words and expressions in this passage, which are not omitted in the petition, *tends* to impose upon the public an absolute falsehood. The petitioners do not represent *all* subscriptions to be inconsistent with the fundamental principles of a protestant church. They declare only against subscribing to the dictates of men of like prejudices and infirmities with themselves, and who can have no competent authority to impose subscription to their dictates, before they have proved themselves to be *infallible.* The *fun-*

damental principles of a protestant church acknowledge no test but the *word of God* contained in the scriptures, and this the petitioners acknowledge, exclusive of all tests of human device, and to this I presume, they will most willingly subscribe, as a test which comes from an *infallible* source. The subsequent reasoning, so far as it is founded upon this πρωτον ψευδος, is void of all strength and pertinence.

LETTER.

" A design of such consequence as that " which was intended to produce a great alteration in our ecclesiastical establishment wanted the recommendation—of our ecclesiastical governors especially, within whose immediate province the matter in question lay, " who, on that account, had a right to be " consulted, and whose concurrence would " have given it great support.——In a " case immediately respecting our church establishment. The house of commons was " not perhaps the place, from whence such a " design could, with most propriety, take its " rise." p. 3. 4.

REMARK.

If this gentleman is in earnest, (of which, I hope, there is no room to doubt) he will find, that *few* as he supposes our exceptionable things to be, (let us take Dr. Tucker's concessions for an instance) the *alterations* required to rec-

tify them would far exceed the alterations intended to be produced by the petition, both in *magnitude* and number. But when you are to form a *catastrophe* of a tragedy, all sorts of *fictions* are allowable. However the fact may turn out, this gentleman may certainly be enabled to prove, whether *his* wisdom, or that of the petitioners, is of the more fortunate family, by making *his* proposals to the bishops in the first place, and postponing the Commons, till their Lordships think fit to call for their sanction. For, first or last, the Commons must have something to do in a business of this sort; and if they are permitted to *deliberate* upon these alterations at all, it is not much matter whether they do it in the *first*, or in the *second* instance. However this objection is now obviated and ought for ever to be silenced by the answer given to the worthy Mr. Wallaston and his respectable associates.

LETTER.

——" It must be confessed, that the case " of subscriptions, as they now stand by law, " is far from being unexceptionable, and is " certainly capable of great amendment." p. 5.

REMARK.

If this is true, and if the case of subscriptions lies within the *more immediate* province of the bishops, it is, and it has been, for many years, the *more immediate* duty of the bishops, to take away the *exceptionable* matter, and to

make the requisite *amendments*, without waiting for an application from the petitioners, or from any other set of men whatever. The bishops have not done this. The bishops have not attempted to do it. The bishops have not shewn the least public concern to have it done, and there is no apology to be made for them, but either that the case of subscriptions is *not* within their Lordships' *more immediate* province, or that the case of subscriptions, as they now stand by law, is *unexceptionable*.

LETTER.

" It must also be confessed, that if sub-
" scriptions to the articles and liturgy be really
" required in the most rigorous sense the words
" will bear, this carries with it such a strict-
" ness of assent to a set of propositions, some
" of much difficulty and great obscurity, as
" from the very nature of the human mind, a
" number of men cannot truly give, and
" which therefore it is unfit to require." p. 6.

REMARK.

If I understand this gentleman, he meant to say in opening his case, that no ecclesiastical establishment could subsist without a *test*, consequently not the ecclesiastical establishment of the church of England, without requiring subscriptions. But surely, if we admit, that *more* or *less rigorous* senses may be put upon the words we subscribe, the idea of a test, ascertaining the *uniform* assent of sub-

scribers to the same doctrines, vanishes away. And though *one* number of men cannot truly give such a strictness of assent to the difficult and obscure propositions in our liturgy and articles, there is *another* number of men who *say* they *can*. And if the church requires subscription as a *test*, these latter are certainly the men whom the church ought to approve even to the exclusion of those who *say* they *cannot*. Upon this plan, Mess. Madan, Toplady, Pietas, Shirley and their brethren, ought to be countenanced and preferred by the church above all who have written against them. For they say, and I believe they truly say, that the the *most rigorous sense* the words will bear, was *the sense of those who drew up the articles*, and injoined subscription to them, and which, consequently, remains the genuine sense of them to this hour. But as an *exclusion* would be *inconvenient* to the *other* number, who "from "the very nature of the human mind, cannot "truly give their assent to the articles, in "*the strictest sense* the words will bear," they are obliged *in fact*, and by the form of subscription, to give their assent to them in the *very same terms* that *they* do, who subscribe them in *the strictest sense the words will bear*, and that for a purpose plainly and expressly specified, *viz.* For *the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion*, without any regard to the nature of the human mind.

LETTER.

" Perfect unanimity in such subjects is a " thing in fact unattainable, and therefore a " certain latitude of interpretation has been, " as I conceive, claimed to themselves by " the greater part of those who subscribe, " from the reason and necessity of the thing " itself, from great and respectable, I had al- " most said, legal authorities, and from the " prevailing sense and practice of the present " church." p. 16.

REMARK.

This writer, so far as he really wishes that things that are wrong or exceptionable in the church of England, may be rectified and amended, and takes off frivolous objections to such amendments, deserves the thanks of all honest men, and with this part of the performance I shall not interfere, whatever I may think of *his* expedients in comparison with that of the petitioners. But when he attempts to palliate, and plaister over the grievance, as in the passage just quoted, he must excuse me, if I cannot commend either his candor or consistency. He is here contending for a *latitude*, which, however it may be *taken*, is certainly not *given*. It may be true, that " una- " nimity in such subjects" [I suppose he means such subjects as the subjects of our articles] " is in fact unattainable," but if *procuring unanimity*, and *preventing diversity*, are the

same thing, both they who composed, and they who established subscription to our articles by *law*, took it for granted, that unanimity was *in fact* attainable; and their *purpose* to attain it by subscription, is expressly declared, not only in the title of the articles, but by the terms in which subscription is enjoined in the 36th canon, *viz.* to prevent *ambiguity*. Both the church and the law acknowledge and declare this *purpose* to this hour, and will continue to declare it so long as those forms remain, and common language is allowed to convey common sense. Our author says "a *certain* latitude of interpretation is "claimed." But a *certain* latitude is capable of being defined and specified; whereas nothing can be more *indefinite* or *uncertain* than the latitude *taken*. And the latitude which implies that a *negative* and an *affirmative* are the same thing, is just as justifiable as a latitude consisting in using a word in the subscriber's *own sense*, which has a different meaning in the article. That is to say, neither the one sort nor the other of these latitudes is justified, either by the *church* or the *law*, notwithstanding the practices or opinions of all the *Lauds*, the *Burnets*, the *Bulls*, or the *Hoadleys*, which the Letter writer can muster up.

LETTER.

"It seems to me, doing but an ill office to "our public establishment, and to our clergy "who act under it, to endeavour to represent

" this liberty so just and reasonable in itself, I " may say even necessary, as unlawful, by ar- " guing against the legal authority of a royal " declaration, and treating Bishop Burnet's ca- " suistry as fraudulent and jesuitical." p. 22, 23.

REMARK.

It is doing a much worse office to a public establishment, which pretends to be founded on the word of God only, to represent it as *allowing of* a liberty to *prevaricate*, and to pervert common language from its genuine sense, merely to avoid the imputation of usurping an authority, which the said establishment in its most solemn declarations *occasionally* renounces. If Bishop *Burnet's* casuistry is *really* jesuitical and fraudulent, it is a real service to the public establishment to shew that it does not espouse it. Was it a *good office* to the public establishment to condemn subscription to the thirty-nine articles, as a *great imposition?* Bishop *Burnet*, however, did this; and having done it, what end can his *casuistry* be supposed to answer, but to enable the *subscribers* to be a match for the *imposers*, in *their own* way? With respect to the royal declaration, the Letter-writer's arguments in support of its *legality*, will do just as well for King *James* the second's declaration for liberty of conscience. The house of commons branded the former as illegal and unconstitutional, upon the same principles, that the convention parliament stigmatized the other. And I cannot

but hope the Letter-writer was a little mistaken in the principles of the bishop to whom his pamphlet is addressed, if he thought to make his court to him, by advancing such doctrine.

LETTER.

" It is understood on all hands, that both " the clergy and the laity have departed in " many instances from the opinions of our " first reformers; and it is presumed, that they " have in such instances departed rightly, " from the great improvement of religious " knowledge, and the superior advantages " which we, in consequence of it, have enjoy- " ed. Shall we be called back again to preach " doctrines which are almost forgotten, and " at which every congregation, who are com- " petent judges of them, would be surprized " and disgusted? Would this be the best and " most edifying way of performing our obliga- " tions to that church in which we act as mi- " nisters, and of fulfilling with good faith, the " promises we made when we undertook the " office? I apprehend no such congregation " would wish their pastor to acquit himself of " his duty in such a manner; or accuse him of " prevarication and fraud for accommodating " old expressions, where they can be accom- " modated, to what is acknowledged on all " hands more conformable to scripture and " good sense." p. 27, 28.

REMARK.

This general departure of both clergy and laity from the opinions of the first reformers, (supposing it to be true,) is the strongest possible argument, in favour of the petitioners, for laying aside the opinions of our first reformers, as standards of orthodoxy in the church of England, and for adhering to the promise the clergy make when they undertake the office of pastor, viz. *to teach the people nothing, as necessary to salvation, but what they are persuaded may be proved by the scriptures.* What opinion must the laity have of the clergy, when they come to know, that in general, they daily subscribe *ex animo* to the truth of opinions which they have forsaken, and which they are obliged to forsake, or to break the solemn promise they make when they undertake their office? Will not every congregation, which consists of competent judges of the case, conclude, they can have no dependence upon the sincerity of such pastors? On another hand, if both clergy and laity have departed *rightly* from the opinions of our first reformers, why are those opinions still retained in the church of England as standards of faith and doctrine for both her clergy and laity? I say for *both;* for it is well known, that several divines of the establishment have held, and yet hold the laity to be bound by the doctrine of the articles, as well as the clergy who subscribe them. I cannot avoid, on this occasion, congratulating the Letter-writer upon the good fortune he has met with in having a congrega-

tion, who are competent judges of those points of *much difficulty* and *great obscurity*, some of which it should seem, have puzzled some clerks of no despicable abilities.

Dr. Tucker seems not to have been so happy. He tells us, that *common congregations* know not the difference between *Arianism* and *Sabellianism*, and yet he says, that without this knowledge, the Athanasian Creed cannot be understood. I take it for granted, each of these gentlemen took their measures of the *competency* of common congregations from the portions of knowledge they found in the congregations to which they have ministred respectively. But with respect to the matter of fact, is this Letter-writer the only man in the kingdom who is ignorant, that very considerable numbers, both of clergymen and laymen, strictly adhere to the opinions of the first reformers? That many of the clergy so *adhering*, carry off large congregations from those pastors who *depart* from those opinions? That considerable numbers, even in the congregations of these *departing* pastors, refuse to hear them, because they have so *departed?* It is not consistent with the Letter-writer's *modesty* to say, that *all* these *adhering* clergy are either absolutely *unlearned*, or relatively *ignorant* of the *improvements* he speaks of. It is not consistent with his *charity* to say, that these *adhering* congregations are *less competent judges*, than the congregations which have *departed*. It would not, I am afraid, be consistent with *truth* to affirm either of these things. And it is most certain, that what the *departing* clergy

call *accommodation*, the *adhering* clergy and people call *fraud* and *prevarication*, without ceremony or circumlocution. By the restrictive clause in this extract, *viz.* where *they* can *be accommodated*, the Letter-writer seems to acknowledge, that there are instances, where such expressions as he refers to, *cannot* be accommodated either to scripture or good sense. What shall we call the *latitude* that is taken in subscribing *these* expressions? *Accommodation* we cannot call it; and if we must not call it *prevarication*, it seems to be incumbent upon the gentleman to furnish us with a term which may save the credit of the *departing* subscribers. Are inconsistencies of this kind honourable to a public establishment which claims to be founded on the *word of God*? Is it honourable, is it a good office to such public establishment, to defend such inconsistencies by examples and precedents, taken from dispensations and subterfuges used in our law-courts, and other sorts of intercourse of secular commerce? Is it becoming the office, or the obligations of our spiritual watchmen, to sit still and see this unedifying state of things, without so much as *attempting* to redress it, or explaining themselves to the public, why they do not? Is it sufficient to say, that "*Alter-*
"*ations are full of obvious difficulties*, and "perhaps of *unforeseen inconveniences*, from "which even good statesmen and honest di-"vines may shrink without our special won-"der?" Was the risque to be run upon attempting such alterations, greater to my lords the bishops, than to a few private clergymen

assembled at the Feathers tavern? These worthy few, it seems, saw no difficulties or inconveniences which the legislature might not have removed without any ill consequence: and other people are apt to say, that the Lay part of the legislature would have found no difficulties or inconveniences in granting the prayer of the petitioners, if the bishops had not signified their *unwillingness* to have it granted. But I will press the Letter-writer no farther to account for this conduct of our church governors. His benevolence and candour in shewing a desire to *free* his petitioning brethren *from an uneasiness and disquiet of mind, which can arise only from their integrity*, deserve their thanks; and more particularly his observation, that "*subterfuges* and *reserves* are al-"ways painful to honest and ingenuous minds; "and when men have no sinister end in view, "but mean only to discharge the office they "undertake faithfully, they submit with re-"luctance to whatever has the appearance of "these, to whatever may give others the most "distant suspicion of their honour and inte-"grity." p. 32, 33. Which the Dean of Glocester may compare at his leisure, with his own decent and christian proposal to the *scrupulous*, to take on with the dissenters.

No. III.

Extract from *A Collection of several pieces of Mr.* JOHN LOCKE, *published by Mr.* DESMAIZEAUX, *printed for* R. Franklin, 1724.

Among these pieces is, *A Letter from a certain person of quality to his friend in the country, giving an account of the debates and resolutions of the house of Lords, in* April *and* May 1675, *concerning a bill, entitled,* An Act to prevent the dangers which may arise from persons disaffected to the government.

The *prevention* of these *dangers* consisted in a test to be taken by *all such as enjoyed any beneficial office or employment, ecclesiastical, civil, or military, privy counsellors, justices of the peace, and members of both houses.* The debates upon that part of this test which concerned the civil government are not to my present purpose. The latter part of it ran thus.

I do swear that I will not endeavour to alter the protestant religion, or the government either of church or state.

SPEECH.

When this oath came to be debated,—"The "Earl of Shaftsbury very well urged, that it "is a far different thing to believe, or to be "fully persuaded of the truth of the doctrine

" of our church, and to swear *never to endea-*
" *vour to alter:* which last must be utterly
" unlawful, unless you place an infallibility
" either in the church or yourself; you being
" otherwise *obliged to alter*, whenever a clearer
" or better light comes to you."

REMARK.

The duty of *altering* upon the accession of *more light*, is so manifest upon the principles of the protestant religion, that they who affirmed upon a late occasion, that *no alterations were necessary*, must be obliged to affirm also, that almost an hundred years are elapsed without the least addition to the light afforded to these divines of *Charles* the *second's* time; in whose good company Dr. *Tottie* accordingly thinks it an honour that he and his fellows are reproached for prevarication.

SPEECH.

" And he desired leave to ask, where are the
" boundaries, or where shall we find how much
" is meant by the *protestant religion?*

" The Lord Keeper, thinking he had now
" got an advantage, with his usual eloquence,
" desires *it might not be told in Gath, nor pub-*
" *lished in the streets of Askalon*, that a Lord
" of so great parts and eminence, and profes-
" sing himself for the church of England,
" should not know what is meant by the *pro-*
" *testant religion!* This was seconded *with*

" *great pleasantness* by divers of the Lords " the bishops."

REMARK.

These facetious bishops were certainly wiser in their generation, than the bishop of *Winchester*. They had a staunch majority on their side, which made *explanations* quite unnecessary. They were well aware of the consequences, the moment they should make a serious answer to the Earl of *Shaftsbury's* demand.

SPEECH.

" But the bishop of Winchester, and some " others of them, were pleased to condescend " to instruct that Lord, that the protestant re- " ligion was comprehended in the XXXIX " *Articles*, the *Liturgy*, the *Catechism*, the " *Homilies*, and the *Canons*.

" To this the Earl of *Shaftsbury* replied, " that he begged so much charity of them to " believe, that he knew the protestant religion " so well, and was so confirmed in it, that he " hoped he should burn for the witness of it, " if Providence should call him to it. But he " might perhaps think some things *not neces-* " *sary*, that they accounted *essential;* nay, he " might think some things not true, or agree- " able to the scripture, that they might call " doctrines of the church. Besides, when he " was to swear, *never to endeavour to alter*, it " was certainly necessary to know, *how far* " *the just extent of this oath was.* But since

" they had told him that the protestant reli-
" gion was in those five tracts, he had still to
" ask, whether they meant those whole tracts
" were the protestant religion; or only that
" the protestant religion was contained in all
" those, but that every part of these was not
" the protestant religion.

" If they meant the former of these, then he
" was extremely in the dark to find the doc-
" trine of *predestination*, in the 17th and 18th
" *articles*, to be owned by so few great doctors
" of the church, and to find the 19th article to
" define the church directly as the indepen-
" dents do."

REMARK.

His Lordship meant, that, according to this 19th article, " Every congregation of faithful " men, in the which the pure word of God is " preached, and the sacraments be duly mini- " stred, according to Christ's ordinance, in all " those things that of necessity are requisite " to the same," is a true, visible, *independent* church of Christ. The article is evidently aimed at the pretensions of the Roman church, which claims to be the only visible catholic church throughout the world, and, as such, the head of all particular churches, and intrusted with the power of appointing ordinances and officers to rule and govern them all. Now the doctrine of the article could not be urged in its full extent, against this pretence, without subverting the claim of every *national* church, to appoint ordinances and officers for

the particular churches within the limits of the civil jurisdiction in which it is established; that is to say, without espousing the plan of the independents. Old Rogers saw how hard this would bear upon our own national establishment, and therefore, in analysing the former part of the article, he forges two propositions, which are neither expressed nor implied in the terms of the article, *viz.* 1. *There is but* ONE *church.* 2. *The* visible *church is a* CATHOLIC *church.* Which was giving back to the Romanists, all that the article meant to take from them. But this article hath of late puzzled others more than it did old *Rogers.* Archdeacon *Tottie* (who, by the way, hath composed a *new creed*, with the requisite formalities of, *We believe*, &c. and hath had the honour of gaining the *assent* and *consent* of the clergy of his Archdeaconry to the numerous articles of it) having accommodated the terms of this 19th article to his purpose of disguising the plain sense of the 20th, tells his audience, "We are there" [*i. e.* in this 19th article] "told, that *this* church" [the church which, in the 20th hath power to decree, &c.] "may err, even in matters of faith." *What* church may err *in matters of faith?* Surely not the church in the which *the pure word of God is preached,* at least so long as that church continues to adhere to what is preached. The Archdeacon goes on. "And it," [the 19th article] "*instances* in the churches of Jerusa-"lem, Alexandria, and Antioch, as well as "Rome." That is to say, the article instances in churches wherein the *pure word of God* is

not preached. But what are *these instances* to the church wherein *the pure word of God is preached?* Is the church of England *one* such church, or not? Why, a—yes, but—"Dr. "Tottie never heard that the church of Eng- "land ever laid any claim to infallibility." Perhaps not; but did he ever hear the church of England, or any one of those who are authorised to speak for her, acknowledge that she *hath erred*, with the same candor and freedom with which the 19th article taxes the church of Jerusalem, &c. to have erred? The church of England therefore claims to be an *unerring* church *to-day*, whatever she may be *to-morrow*. And it is undoubtedly in this capacity, that she claims power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith, a *power* and *authority* which she cannot pretend to, if she is put upon a level with those churches which *have erred*, not only *in their living and manner of ceremonies*, but also *in matters of faith*. For no church can have power or authority to decree *erroneous* ceremonies, or to decide in favour of *erroneous* articles of faith. And yet if the Archdeacon's argument, drawn from the 19th article, hath any view, it is to put the church of England into the same circumstances with the churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome, which have erred both in manner of ceremonies, and matters of faith, and consequently, have no power or authority to decree the one, or decide the other.—But perhaps we are seeking for a meaning where the honest dignitary had none, but to raise a little dust to accom-

modate his logic to the sagacity of his audience. *See* Dr. Tottie's charge, 1772, p. 10, 11.

SPEECH.

"Besides the 20th article, stating the *authority of the church*, is very dark, and either "contradicts itself, or says nothing, or what is "contrary to the known laws of the land. Besides, several other things in the thirty-nine "articles, have been preached and writ against "by men of great favour, power, and preferment in the church."

REMARK.

As this hath continued to be the case ever since this period, a collective view of these *preachings* and *writings* for a hundred years by past, might not be unedifying, and may perhaps be exhibited in due time, and will serve to give us some notion of the extent of that *latitude*, said to be *allowed* in his Majesty's declaration, under which the orthodox subscribers shelter themselves to this hour. And as Dr. *Tottie* justly observes, though this declaration should not prove to be *legal*, such an exhibition will shew, that, what some people, in this degenerate age, call *prevarication*, is completely justified by the *practice* of these *eminent lights* of our church in *Charles* IId's days.

SPEECH.

"He humbly conceived the *liturgy* was not "so sacred, being made by men the other day, "and thought to be more differing from the "dissenting protestants, and less easy to be "complied with, upon the advantage of a pre- "tence well known unto us all, of making "[such] alterations as might the better unite "us; instead whereof, there is scarce one al- "teration but widens the breach."

REMARK.

One would hope that no argument can be drawn from the fate of the dissenters' bill in a certain august assembly, that the same wretched policy is still in vogue amongst us.

SPEECH.

"And no ordination allowed by it here (as "it now stands last reformed in the *Act of* "*Uniformity)* but what is *episcopal*, insomuch "that a popish priest is capable, when conver- "ted, of any church preferment, without re- "ordination; but no protestant minister not "episcopally ordained, but is required to be "re-ordained: as much as in us lies, *unchurch-* "*ing* all the foreign *protestants* that have not "bishops; though the contrary was both al- "lowed and practised from the beginning of "the reformation, till the time of that Act, "and several bishops made of such as were "never ordained priests by bishops."

REMARK.

I have heard it said, that as the act of *uniformity*, 14. Car. II. hath no healing retrospective clause confirming these presbyterian ordinations, if the ordination of an incumbent of the present time could be clearly derived from one of them, though an hundred years ago, the law would oblige such incumbent to be re-ordained, before he could be intituled to the profits of his living. And even then, he would have to shew, that the re-ordaining bishop could make out his succession from King Harry's bishops, without one break in the episcopal manœuvre, by the unhallowed hand of a presbyter: and whatever may be the *law*, this we know is the *divinity*, which entitles our *brethren*, the catholic priests, to step over the threshold without the ceremony exacted of our protestant *adversaries*, who have only, it seems *pretended* holy orders.

SPEECH.

" Moreover, the uncharitableness of it was " so much against the interest of the crown " and church of England, (casting off the " dependency of the whole protestant party " abroad) that it would have been bought by " the pope and the French king at a vast " sum of money; and it is difficult to con- " ceive so great an advantage fell to them " merely by chance, and without their help, " so that he thought to *endeavour to alter*, and " restore the liturgy to what it was in Queen

" Elizabeth's days might consist with his be-
" ing a very good protestant.

" As to the *catechism*, he really thought it
" might be mended; and durst declare to
" them, it was not well there was not a better
" made.

" For the *homilies*, he thought there might
" be a better book made; and the third ho-
" mily, of *repairing and keeping clean* of
" churches, might be omitted."

REMARK.

His lordship probably, proposed the omission of this homily, in consideration of the little importance of the subject of it, when compared with the rest. Or, perhaps, he might see in it, (as who may not) some traces of that very superstition, which is censured in the three foregoing discourses, *against peril of idolatry, and superfluous decking of churches.* Of one of which, Fuller the church historian says, that " it stands with a spunge in one " hand to wipe out all pictures, and a hammer " in the other, to beat down all images of " God and saints erected in churches." *Church Hist.* XVI Cent. Book ix. p. 75. A sort of *peril* of which, it seems, we need not be apprehensive, since a certain enlightened dignitary published his book intitled, *The Ornaments of Churches considered, with a particular View to the late Decoration of the parish church of* St. MARGARET, Westminster; wherein the author lays himself out to confute all the arguments urged in the said homilies, against

setting up images in churches, with a profusion of learning and zeal, which would not disgrace the subtlety or the cause of a *Bellarmine*. The orthodox of the present mode would, I am afraid, be displeased with us should we say, that neither this writer, nor the eminent doctor who *decorated* the chapel in *Charlotte-street*, with a picture of the *annunciation*, could subscribe the *thirty-fifth* article of the church of England, without a spice of *prevarication*. Both of them, no doubt, had their salvos. Both of them, no doubt, saw the necessity of asserting the religious honour due, not only to the virgin MARY, but to St. GEORGE of *Cappadocia*, and St. CATHERINE of *Alexandria*, against the *fanatics*, who were for adhering to the plain sense of two or three obsolete homilies.

SPEECH.

" What is yet stranger than all this, the *ca-*
" *nons* of our church, are directly the old po-
" pish canons, which are still in force, and no
" other ; which will appear, if you turn to the
" statute 25. *Henry* VIII. c. 19. confirmed
" and received by 1. *Elizabeth*, where all those
" canons are established, until an alteration
" should be made by the king, in pursuance
" of that act; which thing was attempted by
" *Edward* VI. but not perfected, and let
" alone ever since, for what reasons, the lords
" the bishops could best tell."

REMARK.

These laws of *Henry* VIII. and *Elizabeth*, stand just as they did in 1675, under the *proviso*, that " such canons, &c. be not contra- " riant or repugnant to the laws, statutes, and " customs of this realm, nor to the damage " or hurt of the king's prerogative royal;" which gives many of them a currency in our ecclesiastical courts at this day. The *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, prepared in the reign of king *Edward* VI. was intended to put the canon law upon a less exceptionable footing. Perhaps matters are just as well now as *that* reformation would have made them; but why all other reformation of the canon law should be *let alone* for two hundred years, is a question, that is frequently asked, but not easily answered. The plan of the intended reformation of the ecclesiastical laws, took in the modification of doctrines. Dr. Tottie hath condescended to take an article from it, for the use of his *new creed*. Had the petitioners ventured upon such a step, they would have been told of their presumption in departing from the established faith.

SPEECH.

" And it was very hard to be obliged by " oath, *not endeavour to alter*, either the " English common prayer book, or the canon " of the mass.

" But if they meant the latter, that the *pro-* " *testant religion* is contained in all those, but

" that every part of those is not the *protestant* " *religion*, then he apprehended it might be " in the bishop's power to declare, *ex post* " *facto*, what is the protestant religion or not, " or else they must leave it to every man to " judge for himself what parts of those books " are or are not; and then their oath had been " much better let alone."

REMARK.

By good luck, it *was* let alone. But a commodious *succedaneum* in the 36th canon hath made the loss of this oath the less to be regretted, particularly as the subscriptions there enjoined, do not leave it to every man to judge for himself what parts of those books are, or are not the protestant religion; superseding all *ex post facto* declarations but one, *viz.* that the established dignity of those five tracts renders the whole *unalterable*, and takes away all occasion of specifying the particulars of the *protestant religion.*

NARRATIVE.

" Much of this nature was said by that lord " and others, and the great officers and bishops " were so hard put to it, that they *seemed* wil- " ling and convinced to admit of an expe- " dient."

In consequence of this *seeming* willingness, certain *expedients* were offered by certain lords, who thought as Lord Shaftesbury did; particularly *one* by Lord Grey, of Rolston.

" But," says the narrative, " the Lord " Treasurer, who had privately before con- " sented to it, speaking against it, gave the " word and sign to that party, and it being " put to the question, the major vote answer- " ed all arguments, and the Lord Grey's pro- " position was laid aside.

REMARK.

How happy are we in these times, when the major vote is of no service to any cause, without the superior argument! But the case is indeed too serious for *pleasantry*, unless it is the *pleasantry* of the *winners*. To others it must be a subject of unfeigned sorrow, that the leaders of our theological fashions are got no farther in the science of church policy, than the system of a set of men, who conformed their protestant discipline to the views of a popish king. Ye spirits of Burnet, Tillotson, Locke, Clarke, Newton, Hoadly, &c. what is become of your *labours*, to prepare the minds of the rising generation for the execution of the generous plan of christian reformation, you so clearly pointed out to them! What of the *hopes*, which some of you expressed, that religious oppression could not long survive the re-establishment of civil liberty by those gracious princes who delivered us from the politics of a *Petre* and a *Bolingbroke!* But the scene is too mortifying for a retrospect. Well may we say with *Ophelia*,

———Woe are we,
T'have seen what we have seen, see what we see.

FINIS.

BISHOP TAYLOR's

JUDGMENT

ON

ARTICLES and FORMS of Confession in particular CHURCHES;

WITH NOTES,

And an EPISTLE DEDICATORY,

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND

The LORD BISHOP of LICHFIELD and COVENTRY.

" How miserable is the condition of depraved humanity! Hea-
" ven sends us into life with the seeds and principles, at least of in-
" tegrity and honesty. The vulgar of all denominations presently
" lose these virtues in the commerce of the *world*. And the MEN
" OF SCIENCE in the SCHOOLS. The consequence is, a *prac-*
" *tice* void of morality, and A SPECULATION void of TRUTH."

Remarks on Mr. DAVID HUME's *Essay on the Natural History of Religion.* Second Edit. p. 101.

[FIRST PRINTED, M DCC LXXVIII.]

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE editor is aware of some spirited and pertinent *Remarks on Bishop* HURD's *Charge*, by a *country clergyman*, lately published, which may well be thought sufficient to have superseded the following address; but Bishop *Taylor's* little tract falling in the way of the editor, and suggesting some topics, not particularly noticed in those *Remarks*, he hoped it would not be thought superfluous to offer his sentiments on Bishop TAYLOR's performance, and at the same time, to take a more particular view of Bishop HURD's charge, by way of contrasting the different ideas of two eminent prelates, equally cordial and zealous in their attachment to the church of England: the result of which, he presumes, will serve to convince the impartial and dispassionate, of the little edification or utility that is to be reaped from an unwarrantable policy, which has been so long a reproach to the protestant religion, as well as a grievance to so many serious and pious professors of it.

DEDICATION.

TO THE

Right Reverend the Lord Bishop

OF

LICHFIELD and COVENTRY

My Lord,

THE *moral demonstration of the truth of the christian religion*, re-published by your lordship from bishop Taylor's *Ductor Dubitantium*, was indeed *new* to the editor of these papers, and gave him something more than a bare curiosity to know, what the author of so excellent a tract had said upon other subjects, in that voluminous work.

In turning over the book, he met with the following remarkable discourse on *subscription to articles and forms of confession*,* a subject

* Book ii. chap. 4. Rule xxiii. p. 356.

much debated both in former and later times, and which has not been thought unworthy of your lordship's consideration so lately as the year 1776.

The editor had not observed, that in any of the late controversial pamphlets concerning subscription, bishop TAYLOR's judgment had been referred to on either side; and on that account imagined, that a new edition of it would not be an unacceptable publication to that part of the clergy, who *interest* themselves in the determination of a question, of no small importance to the reputation of the church of England, and the integrity of so large a number of her members, as are required to subscribe their assent to her established forms of doctrine and worship.

Bishop TAYLOR seems to have been as candid and explicit a casuist as most of that profession. But it is of the essence of casuistry to be ambiguous and obscure in its positions, and too commonly evasive and indeterminate in its conclusions. The editor, on that account requests, that the notes subjoined to the bishop's tract, may be taken only as an *attempt* to ascertain the meaning of several passages in it, which seemed to him not to be expressed with sufficient precision. In this he may have been unsuccessful; and therefore submits himself, with all humility, to the correction of those who have more discernment in scrutinizing the force and effect of casuistical distinctions.

It seems, however, that bishop TAYLOR went upon principles different from those es-

poused by your lordship, in your *charge delivered to the clergy of the diocese of* LICHFIELD *and* COVENTRY, at your lordship's primary visitation in 1775 and 1776. A circumstance which, together with the high esteem your lordship expresses of bishop TAYLOR's piety and good reasoning, gave the first hint to the editor, to inscribe his papers to your lordship; a liberty which he should not have taken, but with a view of receiving all possible satisfaction on a subject, which he is certain is, in your lordship's opinion, as well as his own, of great importance.

It is true, there is no necessity that, because your lordship agrees with bishop TAYLOR in his *demonstration of the truth of the christian religion*, you should agree with him in his judgment on *articles and forms of confession in particular churches*. Your lordship hath put in a sufficient caution against any such conclusion, in the editor's preface to the *moral demonstration;* by allowing, that "some few "facts and testimonies alledged in the course "of the argument by Dr. TAYLOR, have, on "stricter examination, been found not so per-"tinent or considerable as they were taken to "be in the writer's time."

And yet as your lordship so cordially agrees wirh the bishop in the foundation of christianity, it must surprise some of the readers of both performances, that the authors should differ from each other so widely and so materially, concerning what is understood by both to be built upon it, that it is impossible the

ground work should sustain both your superstructures.

Your lordship will therefore, I trust, permit me to point out, with all due deference to your lordship's station in the church, and with a very high estimation of your lordship's eminent abilities, some particulars in yur lordship's charge which have not yet convinced me, that subscription to the articles of religion, and other forms of confession established in the church of England, can be justified upon the genuine principles of the protestant religion.

Your lordship seems to lay your foundation in the words of our Saviour to his apostles, John xv. 16. *I have chosen and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain:* and this text your lordship understands to belong to the clergy of all future times, as well as to the apostles; for it is said:—"In these affecting words "of our divine master, the apostles first, and "after them, all succeeding ministers of the "gospel, are called upon to bring forth, "1. The fruit of a right faith in their hearers, "&c." And again; "Such, my reverend "brethren, is the end for which WE are *chosen* "and *ordained* to serve in the church of Christ." p. 3.

I am one among many others, my lord, who have always thought it extremely unsafe and precarious, to apply any words of our Saviour, by which he commissioned his twelve apostles, to the office and authority of the modern clergy. For,

1. The *choice* and *ordination* of the latter is different from that of the apostles in so many respects, and particularly in having in it so large a mixture of human policy, that few who take the trouble to compare the circumstances of each, will be persuaded that both originate from the same authority.

2. If the modern clergy are *chosen* and *ordained* by Christ, and in consequence of the words cited by your lordship, every sentence and every word of this fifteenth chapter of St. John's gospel, and indeed the whole discourse of our Saviour to his apostles, from the beginning of the fourteenth to the end of the sixteenth, must be considered as addressed to the *present* clergy, as well as to them, which I presume, your lordship for very evident reasons, will not insist upon.

3. So far indeed is your lordship from confining (as some narrow minded divines have done) this *choice* and *ordination* to the clergy of the episcopal church of England, that you have imparted it to "all succeeding ministers "of the gospel," that is to say, to every minister of every christian church, and of every congregation which professes the religion of Christ. The concession is benevolent, and worthy of your lordship's candour and good sense, (for all of them have, in fact an equal claim to the honour) but whether this concession is not rather too liberal to consist with some subsequent parts of your lordship's discourse, we may have occasion to consider as we proceed.

4. As it is so evident, that the clergy of modern times are not *actually* and *personally*

chosen and ordained by Christ himself, it will be natural to ask, how this apostolic choice and ordination is transferred to them? Your lordship seems to have obliged yourself to answer, that they are chosen and ordained in *virtue* of this text, and as being employed in bringing forth the same fruits that were brought forth by the apostles.

But is not this to say, that they are *virtually* thus chosen and ordained? In other words, that they they are the *virtual* representatives of the apostles?

This, I acknowledge, has been the plea of many other ecclesiastical writers; but whenever it has been examined by the record, it has always been found, that *virtual representation*, is as great a solecism in christian divinity, as it has lately been proved to be in state policy.

Your lordship, however, having *thus* ascertained the choice and ordination of *all* ministers of the gospel after the apostles, proceeds to enumerate the *ends* for which they are so *chosen* and *ordained*; the first of which is said to be, to instruct their hearers in the *right faith*.

"The *first* object of our ministry," says your lordship, "is to instruct our hearers in the "RIGHT FAITH; and to this end we are re- "quired to *take heed to our doctrine.*" p. 4.

But, with due submission, it does not appear to me, that is the FIRST object of the christian ministry; at least our Saviour seems to have been of a different judgment, John vii. 17. *If any man will do his will*, says our

Lord, *he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.*

The first object of the christian minister seems from this text to be, to teach his hearers the WILL OF GOD, or the preceptive part of the christian religion in the *first* place, and to enforce the practice of it, as an *indispensible inlet* into the knowledge of the doctrine.

In proof of your lordship's position, your lordship seems to lay great stress upon the text, 1 Tim. iv. 16. and in appearance, at least, to infer from it, that " a *dogmatic theology* be- " comes essential to christianity."

But neither is it recommended to Timothy to *take heed to his doctrine*, as his *first* object, for he is previously enjoined to *take heed to himself.*

The Greek word in Timothy, is διδασκαλια, which signifies teaching upon any subject; but if your lordship would have it in this place, to mean *dogmatic* teaching, I hope your lordship will allow, that διδαχη (our Saviour's word in St. John) is full as expressive of *dogmatic theology* as διδασκαλια; and, as it is used by the evangelist in the passage above cited, undoubtedly means the doctrine peculiar to the christian dispensation; whereas διδασκαλια *may* mean instruction of any sort, as particularly the instruction to be learned from the writings of former times. *Rom.* xv. 4.

Let me not be thought to find fault with your lordship merely for not distributing the heads of your subject in logical arrangement. The observation is of importance, and experience has justified the wisdom of our blessed

Lord, in all the subsequent times of christianity. If the rulers of the church in early times, had not besotted themselves, and perplexed their hearers by beginning with *dogmatic* theology, instead of inculcating the necessity of *doing the will of God* in the *first* place; and if they had begun to *take heed to themselves*, before they began to take the *sort of heed* they did to *dogmatic* theology, "the *most* "violent animosities among christians," spoken of by your lordship in the sequel, had probably been avoided.

Your lordship, however, asserts, that "a "*dogmatic theology*, becomes *essential* to "christianity."

Dogmatic theology, my lord, is an ungracious, rough, scholastic expression; and when applied to the doctrines of the gospel seems to derogate from the simplicity of them, and is not a little ominous to *the peace and good will among men*, which was proclaimed, as the result of it, by the angelic host; and I could not help observing, how much better the paragraph where it stands, would have read without it, and have been equally intelligible, thus:

"The religion of Jesus, claiming to be from "God, the *doctrines* it delivers, are as well to "be believed, as its precepts to be observed, "—and its professors are equally bound by a "certain rule of *faith* and *manners*."

Dogmatic theology, is indeed a term proper enough to characterise those creeds and confessions which have been fabricated and imposed upon the churches of Christ, as a rule of their *faith*, by men who ambitiously affected

to *have the dominion over it.* But I would willingly hope your lordship did not introduce it here, by way of making room for the *justification* of such creeds and confessions, as *essential* to christianity. And yet, why else is it mentioned?

But, however, it must not be admitted that any thing of the doctrinal kind is essential to christianity but what is contained in the scriptures; and your lordship accordingly informs us, that "when the scriptures of the New Tes- "tament were made public, these were the "rules of faith to the whole church of Christ." That is to say, to *all* christians.

And are they not so still? It should seem *not* in your lordship's opinion; for thus you proceed.

"And if that church had agreed in the in- "terpretation of them; or if peace and charity "could have consisted with its disagreement, "*no other provision* for the maintenance of the "faith had been thought needful." p. 5.

The purport of which seems to be, "that "the whole church of Christ not agreeing in "the interpretation of the scriptures of the "New Testament, and their disagreement be- "ing inconsistent with the peace and charity "of *that* church, the scriptures of the New "Testament were thought *insufficient* for the "maintenance of the faith; and therefore "SOME OTHER provision for the maintenance "of the faith was thought needful."

This, my lord, is assumed as a fact, which your lordship proceeds to account for and explain, as follows;

" But the scriptures, like all other writings, " being liable to a different construction, ac- " cording to the different views and capacities " of uninspired men, and it being presently " found that such difference of construction, " produced the most violent animosities among " christians, while each sect pretended a divine " authority for its own fancies; no remedy oc- " curred, &c." *Ibid.*

Your lordship has touched this matter with much prudential caution, but the representation is too superficial to be satisfactory to those who are disposed to examine into the real state of the facts of which this cursory view is given by your lordship.

The remains of ecclesiastical history have afforded some farther light into the transactions of the times, and characters of the men to whom your lordship hath alluded; and from these we learn,

1. That it was not *the whole church of Christ* that disagreed in the interpretation of the scriptures, but chiefly *churchmen*, who gave themselves the name of THE CHURCH, and on that pretence, undertook to give rules and laws to all other christians.

2. It appears that this disagreement of interpretations, did not arise so much from the different construction to which the scriptures are liable, as from the terms and phrases introduced into their interpretations from a *dogmatic* philosophy, totally different from, and totally unauthorised by the terms and phrases of scripture. This, I think, your lordship will allow; for as you call these interpretations " the fancies of uninspired men, *pretending*

" only to divine authority," your lordship will hardly contend that they could arise from any fair and just construction of the scriptures.

3. Ecclesiastical history informs us, that these uninspired men were bishops and priests, assuming, either singly or in large assemblies, to impose their own interpretations of scripture upon the members of those sects who were respectively induced to adhere to them. But these bishops and priests were *ministers of the gospel*, and consequently, according to your lordship, were among those, who, after the apostles were *called upon to bring forth fruit;* that is to say, they were *chosen* and *ordained* by Christ, as *virtual* representatives of the apostles, that they might bring forth fruit. But surely the fruit they were *chosen* and *ordained*, and *called* upon by Christ to bring forth, could not be *violent animosities among christians.*

What shall we say then? shall we degrade these men from the honour of being *chosen* and *ordained* by Christ, on account of the evil fruit they brought forth? But would not their advocates (for advocates they have had, from the commencement of their appearance, to the present hour) plead, that every one of them in his own opinion, brought forth the fruit of a *right faith?* That each of *their* different interpretations of the scriptures, was equally authentic with those of the more modern leaders of the church? and for the rest, that the circumstances of the *choice* and *ordination* of *them* were equally apostolic with those, with which the clergy of the diocese of *Lichfield* and *Coventry* have been *chosen* and *ordained?*

These particulars, my lord, prevail with me to wish, that your lordship had not founded the clerical function, *as it is now conferred and exercised*, upon so high an authority. There is little credit or advantage to be got by claiming a privilege, as an indispensible qualification for inculcating a *right* faith, which is enjoyed in common with those who have manifestly inculcated a *wrong* one; and of whose ministry the *remaining* fruits (the most conspicuous of them at least) were "violent ani-" mosities among christians."

Let us see, however, whether, in quest of a remedy, we may not profit by the healing wisdom of succeeding times, as held forth by your lordship, who informs us, that,

"No remedy occurred for these disorders, "but that the catholic church should be held "together by one and the same confession, "received and acknowledged by all its mini-"sters." p. 5.

But it would be to little purpose that this remedy should occur to any but those who had the authority or the power to apply it. And who were they? If we go to ecclesiastical history we shall find that they were only another set of churchmen assembled in some council called œcumenical, and who, in virtue of calling themselves the *catholic church*, took upon themselves to interpret the scriptures, and to prescribe a rule of faith for the *whole catholic church*, that is to say, for every individual professing the christian religion on the face of the earth; and yet we find, that this rule of faith was only to be received and acknow-

ledged by all the *ministers* of the catholic church; which may create a suspicion, that the ministers had been in the opinion of the council, the chief authors of the disorders in the church; and that without their unruly and pragmatical zeal in favour of their own fancies, the lay-members of the catholic church would have been very peaceable and unanimous in receiving the scriptures as their only rule of faith.

Again, what was this "one and the same "confession?" It was a form of words devised by these leaders of the church, consisting of such interpretations of the scriptures as appeared to themselves to be reasonable and true, and condemning every other interpretation as false and heretical.

But a project of this kind must, upon the very face of it, appear to be productive of fierce contradiction from those whose interpretations were condemned, and to whom the infallibility of the council or the creedmaker was not previously demonstrated. And if this was the *only* remedy that occurred to these reverend fathers, they must have been very deficient, either in sagacity, or humility, for they might have found a hundred remedies in the writings of the apostles, both more practicable in their application, and more promising with respect to their effect.

"But," as your lordship justly observes, "this extensive project was afterwards found "impracticable." And no wonder. But not altogether on account of its *extensiveness;* for

there is a *confession* in the New Testament, *Rom.* x. 9. which, if it had been proposed to be received and acknowledged by the whole catholic church, in its native simplicity, would not, I am persuaded, have met with one dissenter in the whole body, who was sincere in his profession of christianity.

The case appears to have been this; some of the ministers to whom this general confession was proposed by the council as a test of their *right faith*, thought themselves sufficiently inlightened to perceive, that it contained *false* interpretations of scripture. Others questioned the authority of the council, though called œcumenical, to prescribe exclusive interpretations of scripture; and on these accounts, with a pretty large mixture of personal animosity, this projected remedy became an inflammatory incentive to the disorders already subsisting among christians, and instead of abating, added greatly to the evil.

The substitute for this remedy which had miscarried, was, according to your lordship, that, "those who agreed in the same interpre-"tation of the sacred oracles, should be *allowed* "to separate from all others, and unite them-"selves in one distinct and *subordinate* church."

This, my lord, seems to be a very interesting piece of church history, and naturally suggests an enquiry, by whom were these men *allowed* to separate from all others? and to whom, upon their separation, did the church they formed become *subordinate?* If they were *allowed* to separate by any superior and competent authority, and separated in *subordination* to that au-

thority, we lose the idea of schism, which your lordship says afterwards, was *thus* introduced into the church.

On the other hand, if these men separated of themselves from all others without such *allowance* or *authority*, and united themselves by mutual agreement, and by their own authority, they became a voluntary society, *subordinate* to no man or body of men out of their own fraternity.

Again, "those who agreed in the same in-"terpretation of the sacred oracles, were al-"lowed to separate *from all others*;" that is, from all who did *not* agree in the same interpretations.

What became of these others? Did they continue still their violent animosities? No, for this allowance was the remedy for these disorders. The alternative is, they were all *allowed* to unite themselves in separate societies, according to their several interpretations of the sacred oracles. But unless your lordship can point out the superior authority which had the controul of them *all*, we must look upon each of these churches to be *co-ordinate* with the rest, and to have no common superior, but Christ. And then again, the idea of schism vanishes away, for no separation can be unlawful or even blameable, where there is no earthly authority to prescribe the terms of union, or no co-ercive power to restrain or correct the separatists.

To talk of *allowing* or *tolerating* where there is no man or church in existence, which hath

authority to *prevent* or *restrain* what is said to be *allowed* or *tolerated*, is at the best, using a confused and obscure language; which is of no service to any writers, but those who have such indirect views, as must not at any rate be imputed to your lordship.

I can indeed easily conceive the difficulties your lordship must be under, in assigning *a local habitation and a name* to this paramount authority, to which your lordship supposes the separating churches to be *subordinate*. For after the church of England hath so positively asserted, that "the churches of *Jerusalem*, "*Alexandria*, *Antioch* and *Rome*, have erred, "not only in their living and manner of cere-"monies, but also in matters of faith," your lordship, could with no good grace have conferred a controuling authority on any of them; and where to find an *unerring* church with which to intrust such authority, no man can tell.

At length, indeed, your lordship rids us of all apprehensions of *schism*, either as an evil or a crime, as resulting from the separation of disagreeing churches, by stating the *toleration* to be *mutual*, not the effect of a *tolerating* or *allowing* authority, but of a *general principle* adopted by each separate community; that is of a general principle, that all these communities were *co-ordinate*, and none of them *subordinate* (a word dropped, perhaps inadvertently, in the preceding page) to any person, or to any church whatsoever.

Your lordship reports it as a fact, that "though "a diversity of interpretation in consequence

"of this liberty" (of separating) "prevailed "in different christian communities, which "yet acknowledged the same common rule, "*the scriptures of God;* still, peace was, by "this means, preserved in *each* particular com- "munity." p. 6.

It is to be wished your lordship had ascertained the period in the history of christianity, when this was the case; or indeed pitched upon any one community in any period where peace was preserved "by virtue of this expedient;" that is to say, by virtue of adopting a confession, agreeing with their interpretation of the scriptures, different from other churches.

The general histories of those times afford us no satisfactory evidence of the truth of your lordship's account. One proof indeed of the effect of confessions in particular churches, they *do* afford; namely, that their members, or rather their ministers, disagreeing about the signification of the terms used in their confession, referred the matter in dispute to some distant bishop, and in length of time, to the bishop of Rome, as having pre-eminence over the rest, who obliged them all, in the event, to accept of *his* confession, as decisive of all disputes.

This *expedient* it must be confessed, preserved a very profound peace for a very considerable time, through all the *quarters* of the catholic church so called.

If your lordship can produce any instance where peace was preserved, in particular churches, by virtue of any other sort of operation of

their peculiar confession, the information will be both new and curious.

Your lordship, however, seems to be so secure in the certainty of this fact, that you venture to say, "This, in one word, is the ORI-"GIN and at the same time, the JUSTIFICA-"TION of creeds and confessions."

Now, my lord, the *origin* of creeds and confessions assigned by your lordship, is, that "*some other provision* for the maintenance of "the faith, besides the scriptures, was thought "needful;" which clearly implies the *insufficiency* of the scriptures as a rule of faith, or for the maintenance of the faith.

But will this presumption, (without looking into the shocking consequences of it) *justify* creeds and confessions of human device, to any genuine protestant upon earth? Why then will your lordship put it off for such *justification* upon a mere supposition? For the fact by which the *justification* of creeds and confessions, as derived from this origin of them, should be confirmed, is, even in your lordship's report, merely ideal, ending in this futile disjunctive, that peace *was, or might be in a good measure, preserved,* &c. by the expedient of confessions.

Your lordship goes on. "Which creeds and "confessions are only a bond of union between "the members of each christian society. For "the purpose of them is not to set up human "decisions against the word of God. p. 6."

How far creeds and confessions have been "bonds of union between the members of par-"ticular churches," in former times, has just

been considered. If your lordship alludes to any particular confession of later times, for whose *justification* you are more immediately concerned, the merits of the plea shall be discussed when they are brought more into view.

In the mean time your lordship gives us a *negative* reason for this assertion; "FOR the "purpose of them is *not* to set up human de- "cisions against the word of God."

But suppose this is *not* the purpose of them, will it follow, that they *are* a bond of union between the members of each christian society? But to let that pass.

To set up human decisions *against* the word of God, may signify to set them up either in opposition to, or in competition with the word of God: and (if we except the church of Rome) perhaps no framers of creeds and confessions have avowed any such impious purpose.

But if human decisions, when they are set up, have the same effect, with respect to the word of God, as if they were framed with the express purpose of opposing or rivalling the word of God, it matters little upon what plausible pretences they are exhibited as rules of faith.

From informing us what the *purpose* of creeds and confessions is *not*, your lordship proceeds to state what it is: namely; "by larger com- "ments, and more explicit declarations, in "such points of doctrine, as have been differ- "ently apprehended, and much controvert- "ed, to EXPRESS and ASCERTAIN THE SENSE "in which THEY interpret that WORD [of God]

"who communicate together in the same "church."

I very much doubt, whether, when this account comes to be applied to the members who communicate in that same church of which your lordship is undertaking the justification, you will choose to abide by it. But referring that matter to its proper place, permit me to make a few observations on the account itself.

It is not to be supposed, that the sense of scripture was so clearly expressed, and so indisputably ascertained by these larger comments, and more explicit declarations, that every individual, or even a majority of those who communicated together in the same church, perfectly comprehended that these were authentic interpretations of the scriptures, by means of their own examination. If they did, the dispositions and capacities of the common run of men in those days, must have been very different from those of all succeeding generations.

In these larger comments, and more "ex-"plicit declarations," there must be great variety, and some contradiction with respect to the senses espoused in other churches, and with respect to points much controverted; much abstruse and dogmatic determination, which one in ten of the communicants would not understand; and to those who did not understand them, the purpose of their respective creed or confession, would not be answered; that is, *to them* the sense of scripture would not be ascertained by the confession; and among the numbers who, in these circumstances, communicated with the same church, a large majo-

rity must be supposed to have adhered to it upon very different considerations from those of its orthodoxy, and would have adhered to it on those considerations, whether that church had a confession or not. There were therefore, with respect to creeds and confessions, only the *echoes* of their ministers.

On the other hand, they who required some other sort of proof for the orthodoxy of the confession, would seek it, not from the scriptures, but from some scholastic system, the favourite of their own particular sect. But they who imagine that peace would be thus procured among these co-ordinate churches by mutual toleration are much mistaken as to the fact. The war among them was perpetual, and so continued, till by a general appeal to the universal pastor at Rome, they all became *united* under his authority.

But, however, after all, if the case should be mistaken, and if, according to your lordship, peace was, in a good measure, preserved among these disagreeing churches, by virtue of their several confessions, and the operation of a mutual toleration, it is a thousand pities they should have been disturbed by the interference of the state, that is by the state's giving the preference to one of these churches above the rest. The reprobation and intolerance of all the others, was the immediate consequence of this preference. The confession of the state was adopted, prescribed, and enforced as the common confession, in exclusion of all others.

" Thenceforth the state concurs with the " [favoured] church to enforce one common

" confession, by confining the emoluments *it* " provides for the *encouragement of religion*, " to peculiar doctrines of the favoured church."

This passage, my lord, is not worded with your lordship's usual accuracy. *Religion* ought to be *encouraged* in every subject of the state; emoluments in common language, mean *temporal advantages*, and in this particular passage, *rewards*. Whence some inadvertent readers might be led to suppose, that every subject of the state, is, or ought to be paid for being religious.

Your lordship's meaning, I presume, might be more clearly ascertained by some such alteration as this;——" by confining the maintenance it [the state] provides for the teachers " of religion, to those ministers who *profess* " the doctrines of the favoured church."

All other ministers are of course, excluded from such maintenance; and, as far as depends upon the state, compelled to conform, on the pain of wanting a competent subsistence. Yet these, as your lordship has represented their case at the beginning of your discourse, are, among those " ministers of the gospel, *chosen* " and *ordained* to bring forth the fruits of a " *right faith*;" and therefore your lordship has to shew, that they are not *chosen* and *ordained* in the same manner as the ministers of the favoured church are *chosen* and *ordained*; and that they only bring forth the fruits of a *wrong* faith; otherwise we shall be at a loss to discern the *equity* of thus excluding them from a maintenance: for they will say (and who can confute them) that they encourage

religion as well as the ministers of the favoured church.

But indeed it is not the *equity* of the state towards the excluded ministers or churches to which your lordship is here referring, but its *equity* "towards that religious society with "which it is now so closely connected."

The state, my lord, seldom confers emoluments, without some services in return; and this circumstance requires that we should be informed, upon what stipulations this close connection is formed.

These your lordship has not mentioned. To ascertain these, we must have recourse to the work of another prelate, who hath called this *close connection* an "alliance between church "and state." And from him we learn, that the state confers these emoluments on the favoured church, on the valuable consideration of receiving from her, certain privileges, supposed to be, before this close connection took place, appropriated to the church alone.

Undoubtedly, my lord, *equity* requires of the state, to fulfil the conditions of its treaties, whether with foreign powers, or with its own subjects. But it can hardly be unknown to your lordship, that many intelligent and worthy persons have questioned, whether, supposing the church to have once been in possession of these privileges which she is said to have given up to the state, she could possibly part with them, consistently with her character of a christian church.

By the church your lordship must here mean, *churchmen;* for these alone receiving the emo-

luments, are the parties with whom the state makes the bargain ; and these being the persons intrusted with these privileges, in virtue of being *chosen* and *ordained* by Christ, will certainly be understood by some people, to have betrayed their trust, in trafficking for them with the civil magistrate.

It is doubted likewise whether the civil magistrate, being christian, can, consistently with his profession, accept of, or exercise these privileges. But *prudence* and *good policy* being his only *motives*, and *external peace* and secular utility his only objects in making the contract, he will think his title to them full as good as that of the church; and should the church, at any future time, repent of the bargain, saying, *I have sinned, in that I have betrayed my trust*, the state, I apprehend, would be authorised, in virtue of the concessions made to it in bishop WARBURTON's book of alliance, to answer, *What is that to me? see thou to that.*

But the bargain *is* made, and *equity* requires that it should be performed on both sides, and these above being the conditions of it, it is of no consequence whether the doctrines the state maintains are true or false, popish or mahometan (as Dr. BALGUY acutely observes) provided, as your lordship expresses it, " the state " *conceives* its own true interests to be concern- " ed in maintaining those peculiar doctrines."

The case indeed would vary considerably, if it should be found necessary, that those doctrines *must* agree with the scriptures of the New Testament. For a compliance with that

condition, might deprive the favoured church of that authority by which it conveys its christian privileges to the state, and the state of its lawful power of accepting or exercising them; and by that means, the utility and peace resulting from Dr. WARBURTON's system, might be endangered.

But however, all this this will not enable us to discover the *equity* of excluding the ministers of the unfavoured churches from a maintenance or a share of those emoluments which should in all states, be provided for the teachers of religion. These ministers (I repeat it again) as teachers of religion, come under the character, which according to your lordship, belongs to all ministers of the gospel, after the apostles, namely, of men *chosen* and *ordained* by Christ, at least till it is proved, that this character does not belong to these particular men; which I think your lordship hath not attempted.

"Thus," says your lordship, "whether we "regard the church before it acquires the coun- "tenance of the state, as intent on truth and "orthodoxy, and only meditating how best "to preserve truth in the bosom of peace; "or whether we regard the state, after it af- "fords that countenance to the church, as "studious to provide for its own great ob- "ject, general utility, of which the preserva- "tion of peace makes so considerable a part; "either way WE UNDERSTAND why an agree- "ment of opinion is required in the appointed "teachers of religion." p. 8.

But before we *understand* this, we must understand, what church your lordship describes

by the words, " The church *before* it acquires " the countenance of the state." The catholic church cannot come under this description. This church your lordship hath cantoned into *quarters*, each of them interpreting the scriptures *diversly* from the rest, each of them equally intent on truth and orthodoxy; each of them meditating how best to preserve that truth in the bosom of peace, and each of them subsisting in virtue of the general principle of mutual toleration.

If we suppose the catholic church to be the aggregate of all these particular churches, what reason can your lordship give, why the appointed teachers of religion in them, should be required to agree in the same opinions, or interpretations of scripture, which will not destroy the general principle of mutual toleration, and imply an unjustifiable usurpation of authority in some one of these churches? If, on another hand, we consider these churches as the members of the catholic church, and at the same time enjoying their liberty under a mutual toleration in diversities of opinions, we must say, that the catholic church was intent upon a hundred different truths, and a hundred different orthodoxies, and only meditating how to preserve these truths and these orthodoxies, in the bosom of peace. To suppose the catholic church, in these circumstances, to require all the appointed guides and teachers of religion of these mutually tolerating churches, to agree in the same opinion, is to suppose the catholic church to be *intent* upon reviving the *violent animosities*, which by virtue of the general

principle of a mutual toleration, had been happily composed, which will be but a very indifferent reason, and not to be easily *understood* for making such requisition. The catholic church therefore, is effectually excluded from the case stated by your lordship.

If any particular church be meant by your lordship, it should have been specified by name, in order to make us *understand, why* this agreement of opinion in the appointed guides and teachers of *that* church, is or should be *required, before that* church acquired the countenance of the state.

If the instance is (as I suppose your lordship's hearers would understand you) the CHURCH OF ENGLAND, it would, I believe, be difficult to point out a period when the church of England existed upon the foot of mutual toleration only; or in other words, in a state of independency, *previous* to her acquiring the countenance of the state. Such an independency is with respect to the church of England, a mere theoretic vision, contrived to vest that church in privileges wherewith to barter with the state for its countenance; such privileges as were never in the church's possession; and thus the *fabric* of the *alliance,* being *baseless,* falls to the ground.

The close connection of the church of England with the state, may be said to have begun with the profession of the protestant religion in that state. Before that period the church of England was intent upon *that* truth, and *that* orthodoxy which was the *truth* and *orthodoxy* of the church of Rome, and only medita-

ted how best to preserve *that* truth and orthodoxy in the bosom of the pope.

It was the state that took the church and the church's *truth* and *orthodoxy*, out of the bosom of the pope; and that not without reluctance on the part of the church, that is to say, of the churchmen of England, or what we may call the nominal church of England. And the state thought this so considerable a service to the people, or the *real* church of England, that the state founded upon the merit of it, a title to the management both of the church and churchmen of England. And accordingly Bishop Burnet says, that "the state being sa-"tisfied with the grounds," [that is, with the doctrines] "on which the reformation went, "they received it themselves, and enacted it "for the people."

The church indeed, that is, the churchmen, have not always been satisfied with this interference of the state. All the countenance, and all the emoluments the state could bestow upon them, could not prevent them from grumbling, that the state encroached upon their *apostolic* authority, which, as they have asserted, gave them an independent authority, and an *imperium* distinct from that of the state, and for which they have, at times, fiercely contended; and it may be remembered (perhaps by your lordship) that when Dr. WARBURTON's *compromising* scheme of alliance first appeared, the churchmen of the high orthodox stamp were grievously offended with him, for attempting to change their *old posture of defence;* which indeed was no other than

the posture of brandishing, in the face of the state, the plea, that they were *virtually chosen and ordained by Christ* to bring forth the fruits of a right faith, whether they had the countenance of the state or not; in which, if your lordship be right in the application of your text, they could not be far wrong.

But permit me, my lord, for a while, to give up the fact, and to consider what figure the church will make, upon the supposition that your lordship's representation is true, with respect to *any* church.

"The church, before it acquires the countenance of the state, is to be regarded as intent on truth and orthodoxy, and ONLY meditating how best to preserve that truth in the bosom of peace."

In this situation, the church is well and laudably employed, and in her true and proper character, that is, in the character she assumes, of being "*chosen* and *ordained* by Christ to bring forth the fruits of a *right faith*."

But under favour, my lord, we shall never be able to *understand*, upon what grounds the church, in this situation, should require an agreement of opinion in the appointed guides and teachers of religion.

For how will your lordship distinguish the church, "*regarded* in these circumstances of independence on the state," from the *appointed* guides and teachers of religion? Who *appointed* these guides and teachers of religion? Are they not stated by your lordship to be *chosen*

and *ordained*, and *sent forth*, by Christ himself? And is it not a little incongruous to suppose, men *so* chosen, and *so* ordained, to be subject to any *external* authority, or to any authority distinct from that of Christ, before their connection with the state? It should seem, that if, in these circumstances, an agreement of opinion is required in these appointed guides and teachers of religion, it must be required by *Christ alone*, and then the rule of such agreement must be the scriptures of the New Testament *alone*, and not an human formulary prescribed by any authority distinct from the authority of Christ. The contrary supposition is the chief objection which protestants have to the church of Rome, considered even as an *ecclesiastical* authority.

Well, but by some means or other, this church gets to be countenanced by, and connected with the state; and then, a very considerable alteration in her situation and circumstances takes place.

Before this connection, the church ONLY meditated to secure the *truth* in the bosom of peace; now she must *meditate* something else. She must meditate how to secure *utility* as well as *truth*; or rather indeed, she must give over meditating at all, and leave all meditations upon such matters to the state.

And here indeed *truth alone*, and out of close connection with secular utility, will be out of the question. There may be truths useless, and perhaps inconsistent with the *utility* of the state. True doctrines which the state

may conceive its own true interests concerned *not* to maintain.

The *utilities*, or the *true interests* of the state, are all of the temporal kind, such as belong to the kingdoms of this world and the glory of them; and the *peculiar* doctrines which the state thinks fit to maintain in support of these *utilities* and *true interests*, may be different from, and even opposite, to those doctrines in which the *true interests* of those who are seeking the kingdom of God are comprised; and which it concerns those seekers to maintain.

We may easily *understand* indeed, from hence, why the state should require its own appointed guides and teachers of religion to agree in opinion, in view of *its own great object, general utility*; and why it should exclude those from the office of guides and teachers of religion, who hold opinions and doctrines, though ever so true, which are not conformable to the *peculiar* doctrines of the state.

But what figure must the church make in this kind of connection with the state?—That church which before this connection, was intent upon truth and orthodoxy, and ONLY meditating how to preserve that truth in the bosom of peace, of that *peace* which Christ *left* with his disciples, and which he gave them, *not as the world giveth.* John xiv. 27. that is to say, not that peace which is founded on considerations of *political utility*, but that peace which may be called, with a little variation of your lordship's expression, *the peace of the bosom.*

Can a more dishononrable idea be given of guides and teachers of religion, supposed to be appointed, *chosen and ordained* by Christ, to bring forth the fruits of a right faith, and supposed to be intent *only* on the preservation of truth and orthodoxy, than to represent them all of a sudden, as deserting their original duty and mixing and adulterating the truth with the corrupt maxims of secular utility; resigning the privileges of their original appointment in exchange for an appointment by political powers, whose great object is *utility*, without any especial regard to truth, and who will not acknowledge them for teachers of religion, but upon condition, that they profess to agree in opinion with a precarious common formulary of *peculiar* doctrines, without any solid foundation, but the mere conception of the state, that *its true interest is concerned to maintain them.*

But, it seems we are to understand, that this common state formulary is *true* and *orthodox*· " for," says your lordship, " this formulary " is not proposed in *opposition* to that deliver- " ed in the scriptures, but by way of more " precise explanation of what is believed to " be its true meaning."

And where is the popish priest who will not say as much for the creed of Pope Pius, or the *Trent* catechism? with this advantage, indeed, above your lordship, that he begins with proving, or at least asserting, a paramount authority to explain and interpret for all the world.

The learned and discerning Dr. BALGUY saw this advantage in all its strength; and, sensible, that an *ecclesiastical* authority with

these powers, would not do for a protestant state, he *happily* hit upon the expedient of transforming it into a *civil* authority, for the grounds of which, he told us, it was to no purpose to go to the scriptures: and therefore referred us only to the book of alliance; from whence it was inferred, that, with respect to the obligation of conforming, it was not at all material, whether the state formulary was a protestant, or indeed a christian formulary or not, for that the civil magistrate had it in his option to establish what religion he pleased.

But your lordship, taking the scriptures as a rule of faith into your account, seems to have laid yourself under an obligation of proving, that this *common formulary*, or more precise explanation of what is believed to be the true meaning of the scriptures, is *reasonably* proposed to the guides and teachers of religion, as a test of their right faith; or in other words, that it is proposed to them by a competent scriptural authority.

The notion of a guide or a teacher of religion, pre-supposes such guide or teacher to be properly instructed in the principles and doctrines of the religion he guides or teaches; and it is not what *others believe* to be the true meaning of the scriptures, that is to be the rule of his guiding or teaching, but *his own* belief, till it is proved, that *those others* have an undeniable authority to overrule his judgment, or his belief. In this matter therefore your lordship seems to have left your audience short of proper information.

Your lordship calls this common formulary, "a RULE in subordination to the general rule "of christians;" meaning the holy scriptures; but if it is a rule pretending to make the meaning of the scriptures more plain and precise than the expression of the scriptures hath made it, it is a rule which implies the *imperfection* of the scriptures, as the general rule of the faith of christians. And in this case, it is a rule, not in subordination to the scriptures, but, in fact, the *leading* rule of the faith of christians, by which the guides and teachers of religion "undertake to frame their public instructions."

But upon whatever general principles of government, or political league, your lordship and Dr. BALGUY may proceed in your respective speculations, you will hardly be able to prove, that the christian and protestant magistrate can either *rightfully* or *reasonably* propose "a common formulary of faith, explana-"tory of the meaning of the scriptures, ac-"cording to *his own* belief, regulated by con-"siderations of secular utility," upon christian and protestant guides and teachers of religion as "a rule by which to frame their pub-"lic instruction."

I do not chuse on this occasion to offer my own sentiments in confutation of this hypothesis, but rather to borrow the words of an eminent writer, whose station in the church, if common fame may be trusted, is not inferior to your lordship's, and who considered the propriety of requiring subscription to articles of faith, in an accurate and masterly tract, not

very long before the date of your lordship's charge.

" Seeing the same word of God is owned [by " protestants] to be an adequate rule, amply " sufficient for eternal salvation, and our on- " ly safe guide to it, we ought surely to be " content with this rule, and leave every doc- " trine in exactly the same degree of *specialty* " and *precision* under which it was there ori- " ginally delivered. We should beware of " having any *other gospel preached unto us*, " or any other articles propounded to us *for* " gospel: we neither should ourselves at- " tempt to fix, nor, so far as in us lieth, *suffer* " *others to fix* any standards or criterions of " faith, separate from this gospel, as contain- " ing authentic expositions on any part of it; " and these of such authority, that the text " itself must bend to them upon occasion, and " be determined by these, as they are proved " again by that in a circle.

" Such a proceeding constitutes the worst " part of the whole popish system, and easily " makes way for all the rest; and perhaps an- " swers more exactly than some may imagine " to St. Paul's charge of *corrupting the word* " *of God, and handling it deceitfully.*"

From speculation, your lordship proceeds to the case of subscription, as it is circumstanced in the church of England.

" This confession, or formulary of faith, is " the THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES, to which a " subscription is required from every candi- " date of the ministry; so that THE SCRIP- " TURE interpreted by these articles, is the

" *proper* rule of doctrine to every minister of " our church." p. 9.

Whether they are a *proper* rule of doctrine to *every* minister of the church of England, may be judged of by a circumstance which ought not to be concealed; and which cannot be better represented than in the words of the respectable writer above cited.

" Though these same articles are called only " *thirty nine*, let no man from hence imagine, " that he has only thirty-nine propositions to " deal with. He will find *four or five times* " *that number*, though bound up indeed into " so many bundles. The *second* article alone " contains *thirteen* very substantial proposi- " tions; the *seventeenth*, *twelve*; the *twenty-* " *fifth*, *as many*, and the like may be affirm- " ed, in a greater or less degree, of the rest."

Old Thomas Rogers, who opened these bundles and examined the contents of them, found in them one hundred and thirty-six propositions, but assigns only *four* to the *second* article, *ten* to the *seventeenth*, and *eleven* to the *twenty-fifth;* and if we take in the *thirty-fifth*, which enumerates the homilies, as containing *a godly and wholesome doctrine*, the propositions contained in these articles, will amount to ten times thirty-nine.

" And now," [to cite once more the judicious author of the tract above-mentioned] " may " it not well be questioned, whether in any " one science or subject in the world, so many " distinct propositions can be found, beyond " absolute intuition, or demonstration, where- " in even twelve men, much less where twelv

" thousand, and a perpetual succession of " them through every vicissitude of learning " and knowledge, can be made uniformly to " agree."

And yet your lordship scruples not to affirm, that, " the scripture interpreted by these arti- " cles, is the *proper* rule of doctrine to *every* " minister of the church of England."

" It follows," says your lordship, " from " what has been said, that such as cannot " honestly assent to this formulary, *must* " (if they aspire to be teachers of religion) " unite themselves with some other *consentient* " church."

No, my lord, it does not follow from what has been said, if your lordship means, as a conclusion from a fair argument. It follows from the rigor of a partial, unreasonable, and oppressive law, inflicting calamity upon many worthy, pious teachers of the christian religion, for their *honesty*. For to pass by the inaccurate expression, of *some other consentient church*, such a church as your lordship means, may not be easily found; for other churches are blockaded by articles, from the approach of many an honest man who aspires to be a teacher of religion.

Your lordship goes on: " This compulsion " may, sometimes, be a hardship, but can, in " no case, be an injury; or if some may chuse " to consider it in the light of an injury, it is " such an one as must be suffered by indivi- " duals, for the general good of that society " to which they belong."

Your lordship must allow me to remind you, that this compulsion is exercised upon men, who, for any thing that appears to the contrary in this discourse, are equally *chosen* and *ordained* by Christ himself, with those that compel them. Strong and clear, therefore, should be the evidence, that the compellers have authority to inflict this hardship upon those, who with respect to their original commission, are their equals. But no such evidence being produced by your lordship, we are at liberty to call these compellers, usurpers, and persecutors.

And indeed, my lord, I am afraid, some people will say, such a period as this could never come from the bosom of christian peace, which can never be reconciled to *compulsion* of any kind, in matters of religion. This I am sure of, that expressions approving of and vindicating such compulsion, can never come from the bosom of christian charity.

But pray, my lord, to what *society* may these *honest* non-subscribers be supposed to *belong?* They cannot be said, *properly*, to belong to the society which refuses them its protection, or even its countenance, and that because of their *honesty*.

However, among the people of the place "where they have their abode, "they *must* "suffer hardship and injury for the general "good of that people." And yet they are not accused of any crime against *civil* society, nor represented as infringing the municipal laws of the country, nor are they supposed to be unqualified by their religious opinions, to be

peaceable and obedient subjects, in any department where their abilities and industry might be useful and beneficial to the *civil* community.

In these circumstances, it was surely incumbent on your lordship to be very particular in setting forth the *general good* of the society to which these honest men are said to belong, which could require their exclusion from so many privileges enjoyed by their fellow subjects, whose superior merit consists only in assenting to some religious opinions, to which the others could not *honestly* agree.

Your lordship was at liberty to use the general terms *utility* and *peace*, when you were employed in delineating your theory; but in this part of your discourse, your lordship is advanced to matters of fact; and the mere supposition, that it is for the *general good* of the kingdom of England, that honest and worthy teachers of religion should suffer hardship, because they cannot in conscience subscribe to the thirty-nine articles of religion, will not satisfy an ingenuous and inquisitive mind. It is for the honour of the society to which your lordship belongs, to be candid and explicit in supporting your hypothesis, by indisputable instances.

"It is nothing," says your lordship, "that "some object to these articles, as *improper*, "or *ill drawn.*" That is to say, as improper and bad interpretations of scripture. And is this *nothing?* Does it not concern a protestant community, that the interpretations of scrip-

ture, which it espouses as a rule of faith, should be proved to be neither *improper* nor *ill drawn?*

No, " the CHURCH will judge for itself in " these points."

And is the church then once more got released from the trammels of her state alliance? Is she once more *sui juris*, and in a condition to judge *these points for herself?* so it seems, for she is now become one of those " societies " which have the same right of PRIVATE " JUDGMENT as individuals." It is but a while ago, that the church was a body connected or compounded with another body, and so far from being in a capacity to judge for herself, as an individual, that she was incorporated with the state, and was not allowed either to act or think *for herself* in any points.

But we may congratulate the church upon this emancipation, (though perhaps she might find it difficult to prove it) without allowing the right your lordship asserts on her behalf.

An individual has a right to judge for himself, but *for no one else.* Whatever your lordship may mean in this sentence by the vague term, *the church*, is this the case of the church of England? which is the question now at issue.

Does the church of England, whether considered as consisting entirely of teachers of religion, or as connected with the ministers of civil government, judge for *none but herself?* And if she has this *right* of judging for others, without being accountable to those others, for the *propriety* of her doctrines, it is, I appre-

hend, a right to which a college of apostles never pretended, who were studious to *commend themselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.*

If the church of England, considered as a society, has the *same* right of private judgment that an individual *out* of connection with her has, there is no individual *in* connection with her, who can possibly have any right of private judgment of his own. For the private judgment of the church must be the private judgment of every individual member of the church. Otherwise the church cannot have the *same* right of private judgment, that an individual has as such.

" And," continues your lordship, " till " they" (that is, societies having a right of private judgment) " revoke a constitution, it " should, methinks, be presumed, that they " see no cause to do it ; just as it is very fitly " presumed, on the other hand, that such in- " dividuals as will not subscribe to this con- " stitution, cannot."

We are got again into theory and general speculation ; let us return if your lordship pleases, to the matter of fact.

What is *the* constitution in question ? It is a system of some scores of dogmatical propositions called interpretations of the scriptures, and established as a rule for the appointed guides and teachers of religion, whereby to frame their public instructions.

This system is constituted in consequence of the church of England's having the same right of private judgment as individuals.

But if the right of private judgment asserted by the church of England, destroys the right of private judgment of the individuals of that church, (as has been shewn to be the case) the constitution founded upon it, ought not to have been made, and should certainly be revoked, upon a protestant principle independent of the private judgment of the society, namely, the restoration of the individual to his christian liberty; from which your lordship has precluded him, by debarring him from examining the *propriety* of this constitution by his own private judgment, and referring him only to the private judgment of the church.

The truth is, the two private judgments stated by your lordship are incompatible, and all that is built upon the contrary supposition is utterly incongruous and destitute of foundation. Indeed, my lord, I little expected to find this mean sophistical plea of a *right of private judgment in the church* in any of your lordship's writings. It is every way, unworthy of your lordship's character and abilities; and should be left to the class of small writers in defence of subscriptions, who having no private judgment to exercise, may well be indifferent where the right of it is placed.

Your lordship says, "it is to be presumed, "that the church sees no cause for revoking "this constitution;" and we are farther to presume, that the church declares she sees no cause to revoke &c. *bonâ fide* and with the utmost *sincerity*.

It is indeed presumed, I believe, on all hands, that the church sees causes many to continue

this constitution. It is *convenient* for the church on many temporal accounts, and is continued perhaps for many reasons *not at all allied* to those which individuals give for refusing to subscribe the thirty-nine articles.

But after your lordship had averred, that "this common formulary is constituted in subordination to the general rule of christians, "the holy scriptures;" to presume that the church sees no cause *of another sort* for revoking it, is presuming upon the *good faith* of the church, at the expence of her *knowledge* and *capacity.*

Your lordship concludes this division of your discourse with exhibiting another objection to subscription to these articles, namely, that *the articles themselves are liable to various interpretations.*

Your lordship answers, "Without doubt "they are; and so would any other which "could be contrived. Yet with all the latitude of interpretation of which they are capable, they still answer in a good degree, "the *main end* of their appointment, as may "be seen from the animosity expressed by some "against them, as too strict."

It is, my lord, not a little remarkable, that the virtue your lordship ascribes to confessions, of composing *violent animosities,* in the former part of your discourse, should be so remarkably contrasted by the contrary effect, ascribed by your lordship in the latter part of it to the confession of the church of England. There are your lordship says, animosities raised against the thirty nine articles, on account of

their being too strict. It is still more extraordinary that your lordship should bring this circumstance in evidence, that the articles answer their end in some good degree. Surely, my lord, some few among those who made up the several audiences to which your lordship delivered this discourse, must have felt this inconsistency, and have mused within themselves what end it could answer, either of peace in the church, or utility to the state, that these articles should revive the animosities which former confessions had so happily composed.

They who object to the articles, that they are *too strict*, mean, that they are too dogmatical; more dogmatical than the scriptures. Should not your lordship, instead of glorying in this, as a circumstance favourable to the articles, have bestowed a few lines to shew that this was not the case? Let a dogmatic theology be ever so essential to the christian religion, yet certainly a theology *more* dogmatic than the scriptures can be essential to nothing but a system congenial with that of the church of Rome, and only to be supported and vindicated by that antichristian authority, which exalteth itself above all that is called GOD.

Surely, my lord, the sense of any writings cannot be *precisely expressed and ascertained* by a *variety of interpretations!*

But let us look into the case a little more carefully,

Your lordship has informed us that confessions took their rise from the different constructions put upon the scriptures, which made some other provision necessary for the maintenance

of the faith, the composing of animositics, and procuring peace.

Upon the same footing your lordship places their *justification* as well as their *origin*.

Now, my lord, will your lordship be pleased to inform us, what especial quality the thirty nine articles, *liable* as they are to *different* and *various interpretations*, have to maintain the faith, compose animosities, and procure peace, which the scriptures have not?

The sense of scripture can never be *ascertained*, by *various* interpretations; for various interpretations, are various senses. And why then are not *other provisions* necessary to ascertain the sense of the articles as well as to ascertain the sense of scripture?

Truth can never be maintained by compositions which are variously interpreted; for as your lordship allows, truth can only be on one side.

Your lordship brings an instance where these articles occasion one sort of animosity, and where it is certain the scriptures would occasion none; for whoever thinks the articles are too strict, must think they are stricter than the scriptures in those particular points: and I am sure your lordship knows instances where they occasion still greater animosties, and that among those who do not refuse to subscribe them; each being zealous to defend his own interpretation, and to reprobate that of his adversary.

And now, my lord, what may this *main end* of the appointment of these articles be, which your lordship says they *still answer in a good degree.* The end for which the articles themselves say they were appointed, is for the preventing *diversities of opinions, and establishing consent, touching true religion.*

But to admit that they are susceptible of a latitude of interpretation, and that the church allows them to be subscribed in that latitude which the expression fairly admits, and to grant, as your lordship does, that they are liable to various interpretations, and withal to assert that the main end for which the articles were appointed is still answered in a good degree, is not, my good lord, to *interpret* the title of the articles with *a latitude,* but flatly to contradict it, and give it the lye direct.

Your lordship's concluding period respecting this latitude p. 10. is so very extraordinary, and so destructive of the *utility* we are supposed to receive from the enjoyment of our organs of intuition, that though I shall transcribe it, it shall stand without any remark of mine, and only contrasted, with bishop Taylor's sentiments on the subject; and now take my leave of your lordship, with an humble wish that latitudinarian subscribers, of whom, I am told, there is no inconsiderable number in the church, may for the future, know what to trust to.

Bishop HURD.

" And if we only use
" that latitude which
" theexpression fairly
" admits, and which
" the church allows,
" they (the articles)
" will continue to an-
" swer the *great* end
" hitherto effected by
" them; of preserving
" among the mem-
" bers of the church,
" AN UNITY OF
" THE SPIRIT IN
" THE BOND OF
" PEACE."

Bishop TAYLOR.

" This (latitude) is
" the last remedy, but
" it is the worst; it
" hath in it something
" of craft, but very
" little of ingenuity;
" and if it can serve
" the ends of peace, or
" of external charity,
" or of a phantastic
" concord, yet IT
" CANNOT SERVE
" THE ENDS OF
" TRUTH AND
" HOLINESS, AND
" CHRISTIAN SIM-
" PLICITY."

I am, My Lord,

Your lordship's

humble servant,

THE EDITOR.

BISHOP TAYLOR's

JUDGMENT

ON

SUBSCRIPTION, &c.

Subscription to Articles and Forms of Confession in any particular church is wholly of POLITICAL consideration.

I.

WHEN forms of confession are made, and public articles established, it is of great concernment, not only to the reputation of the government, but to the unity and peace of that christian community, that they be not publicly opposed.

To this purpose we find so many subscriptions to the decrees of councils, by princes and prelates, and priests and deacons, by prefects of cities and governors of countries ; it was an instrument of unity and peace, a declaration of their consent, and at no hand to be reproved unless it be in a false article, or with tyranny to consciences, or to maintain a faction.

But that which the government looks after is, that no new religions be introduced to the public disturbance ; *(a)* of which the Romans were so impatient, that they put to death a noble lady, POMPONIA GRÆCINA, *utpole novæ cujusdam religionis ream*, saith Tacitus; as being guilty of a new religion. *(b)*

Now to prevent this, subscription is invented ; that is, an attestation of our consent ; which if it be required by the supreme authority, it may be exacted in order to peace and unity ; and Tacitus tells, that *Apudius Muræna (c)* was degraded from the diguity of a senator, because he refused to subscribe to the laws of Augustus.

This is the same case, for subscription serves no other end but that which is necessary in government.

We find in Polydore Virgil, that the ancient kings of England at their inauguration, *Silicem tenebant juraturi per Jovem se religionem et ritus patrios retenturos, hæc verba loquentes, si sciens fallo, tunc me Diespiter salvâ urbe arceque, bonis omnibus ejiciat.* "They swore "by Jupiter, that they would keep their reli- "gion and their country rites, and cursed them "selves if they did not." *(d)*

This was more than ecclesiastical subscription; for that bound them to it for ever; this only gives witness for our present consent; but according to its design and purpose, for the future, it binds us only to the conservation of peace and unity. *(e)*

II.

For though it may be very fitting to subscribe a confession of articles, yet it may be very unfit that we swear always to be of the same mind; for that is either a profession of infallibility in the authority or in the article, or else a direct shutting our heart against all further clarity and manifestations of the truths of God.

And therefore subscription ought to be so intended, that he who hath subscribed may not perceive himself taken in a snare.

But yet he that subscribes must do it to those purposes, and in that sense and signification of things, which the supreme power intends in his commanding it ; that is, at least, that he who subscribes does actually approve the articles over-written : that he does, at that time, believe them to be such as it is said they are ; TRUE, if they only say they are TRUE ; USEFUL, if they pretend to USEFULNESS ; NECESSARY, if it be affirmed that they are NECESSARY. For if the subscriber believes not this, he by hypocrisy, serves the ends of public peace and his own preferment.

III.

But this whole affair is to be conducted with some wariness, lest there come more evil by it than there can come good. And therefore although when articles are framed, the sons of the church ought to subscribe them for public peace in case they do heartily approve them ; yet such articles ought not to be made and imposed, unless they of themselves be necessary, and plain by a divine commandment. *(f)*

And this was the advice of Melanchon, *Ut sit igitur discordiarum finis, recte facit potestas obligans homines ut obtemperent, quando alioqui*

parere est necesse ; " the supreme power may " then command men to subscribe to such ar- " ticles, which it is neccssary they should be- " lieve." But if God hath not commanded us to believe them, no human power can command us to profess them.

IV.

Beyond what is necessary or very useful, unless peace be concerned in the publication of the article and its establishment, it is but weakly and impertinently concerned in the subscription. For if the peace of the church be safe without the article, how can it be concerned in the consent to it and profession of it, excepting only by an accidental and a necessity superinduced by themselves and their own imprudent forwardness, or itch of empire over consciences? *(g)*

If an article be contested publicly, and is grown into parties and factions, and these factions cannot be appeased without decision of the question, then the conformity is as useful to peace as the sentence and determination was ; *(h)* and then there is nothing else to be considered, but that the article be true, or believed to be so.

But to them that are so persuaded, it is necessary they obey, if they be required to subscribe; and the supreme power hath authority to require it, because it is one of their greatest duties to govern and rule in peace.

But these things can seldom happen thus, without our own fault; but when they do, there is inconvenience on all sides; but that which is least must be chosen.

V.

When articles are established without necessity, subscription must be required without tyranny and imperiousness. That is, it must be left to the liberty of the subject, to profess or not to profess that doctrine. *(i)*

The reason is plain. In things not certain in themselves, no man can give a law to the conscience, because all such laws must clearly be divine commandments; but if conscience cannot be bound to the article, and the profession serves no necessary end of the commonwealth, then God does not bind, and man cannot; and therefore to bring evil upon men that do not believe the article, and dare not profess to believe what they do not, is injustice and oppression; it is a law of iniquity; and there-

fore it is not obligatory to conscience, and no human authority is sufficient for the sanction and imposition.

Socrates was wont to say, *Sacramentum oblatum duabus de causis fide firmandum; vel ut teipsum a turpi suspicione liberes, vel ut amicos ex magnis periculis eripias.* " When you are " required to give faith and security by a sa- " crament, oath, or subscription, there are two " cases in which you must not refuse; when " thou thyself art suspected, and canst no " otherwise purge thy self; and when any of " thy relations is in danger, that is, when it is " for good to thyself or friends."

But when there is no necessity of faith, and no public need to be served, the causes that besides these injoin subscription, are fond persuasions, and indiscrete zeal, and usurped empire over consciences; *(k)* in which cases, the ecclesiastical state hath no power to give commandments; *(l)* and if the civil state does, they oblige to suffering calamity, but not to any other conformity; and then it is a direct state of persecution.

VI.

Upon the account of this rule, it hath been of late inquired, whether it can be lawful for any man to subscribe what he does not believe to be true, giving his hand to public peace, and keeping his conscience for God. *(m)*

VII.

But to this the answer is easy, if subscription does signify approbation; for in that case it is hypocrisy, and a denying to confess with the mouth, what we believe with the heart. But if subscription were no more than the office of the clerk of the signet, or of a council, who in form of law is to sign all the acts of council, then the consideration were different.

For he that is a public officer, and interposes the signature of the court, not as the account of his own opinion, but as the formality of the court, all the world looks upon it as none of his personal act, but a solemnity of law, or an attestation of the act of the council.

But in subscription to articles of confession, or censure of propositions heretical, every ecclesiastic that subscribes, does it for himself, and not for the court. *Lubens et ex animo subscripsi;* that's our form in the church of Eng-

land. *Consentiens subscripsi ;* so it was in the ancient councils, as St. Austin reports: " I " consent to the thing ; my mind goes along " with it." But in this case the whole affair is put to issue, which I touched upon before.

If the intention of the superior be to require our assent to be testified by subscription, he that subscribes does profess his assent, and whatever he thinks himself, it is the intention of the imposer that qualifies the subscription.

St. Austin tells of a senator that, upon his parole, went to treat for his ransom or exchange, and promised to return to them again, in case he could not effect it. But he going from the army, pretended to have forgot something, and came back presentley, and then departed.

But telling his story to the Roman senate, and pretending himself quit of his promise, because he went back presently, they drove him out of the senate; because they regarded not what he had in his head, but that which the enemy intended, when they made him swear to return.

VIII.

But the effect of these considerations will be this; that no particular church ought with ri-

gour to require subscriptions to articles which are not evidently true and necessary to be professed. Because in the division of hearts that is in the world, it is certain that some good men may dissent, and then either they shall be afflicted, or be tempted to hypocrisy; of either of which if ecclesiastical laws be guilty, they are not for edification, but are neither just nor pious, and therefore oblige not. *(n)*

IX.

But if for temporary regards the supreme power do require subscription, those temporal regards must be complied with, so that the spiritual interest of souls and truth be secured. And therefore, the next good thing to the not imposing uncertain and unnecessary articles is, that great regard be had, and great ease be done to wise and peaceable dissenters. *(o)*

X.

And at last, in such cases, let the articles be made with as great latitude of sense as they can, and so that subscriptions be made to the form of words, let the subscribers understand them in what sense they please, which the

truth of God will suffer, and the words can be capable of.

This is the last remedy, but it is the worst; it hath in it something of craft, but very little of ingenuity; and if it can serve the ends of peace, or of external charity, or of a phantastic concord; yet it cannot serve the ends of truth, and holiness, and christian simplicity. *(p)*

NOTES

Referred to in the foregoing WORK.

(a) That which the government looks after, is that no new religions be introduced, &c. And subscription to articles and forms of confession is the expedient adopted by the government for the purpose of excluding such new religions. But it is admitted, that subscription is reproveable in three cases. 1. When it is required to a false article: 2. When it is exacted with tyranny to consciences; and 3. When it is only the means of maintaining a faction. For examination into these matters, the member of a *christian* community must be sent:—1. To the scriptures, or, in bishop Taylor's terms, to the divine commandment. 2. To his own private judgment: and 3. To the political views of the imposers.———Peace and unity in the christian community, must therefore depend, not upon what is determined in these points by the supreme civil, or political power, but (in the two first cases more especially) upon what the subscriber shall determine for himself.

(b) Pomponia Græcina.] The good bishop cited Tacitus here by memory. Pomponia Græcina was not put to death. She was indeed tried as a capital offender, but acquitted by her husband to whom the judgment of her offence was committed. *Pomponia Græcina insignis femina, Plautio, qui ovans se de Britannis retulit, nupta, ac superstitionis externæ rea, mariti judicio permissa. Isque prisco instituto, propinquis coram, de capite famaque conjugis cognovit, et insontem nuntiavit.* Annal. xiii. 32. The Romans could not be said to be very impatient in this particular case; they seem rather to have considered it in the light of a *family affair.* And as there was an ancient law for trying heretical ladies before their husbands and relations, it should seem, their ancestors were of the same opinion. *Romuli lege,* says Lipsius, *matrona adulterij rea, marito permissa cognatisque.* Excurs. in Annal. iv. 42. This ordinance supposed that the offence rather concerned the culprit's family than the community at large; and such undoubtedly was the legislature's opinion in the case of religious ceremonies; otherwise what must become of the bishop of *Glocester's intercommunity* of foreign rites with the public established rites of the state? Strabo, as quoted by Lipsius upon this passage of Tacitus, says, *Women are generally esteemed to be the chief promoters of superstition, and*

engage their husbands to attend religious feasts and ceremonies and all kinds of superfluous worship. Bachelors, and men who live alone, are seldom found to be so disposed. This may serve as a presumptive argument at least of the general lenity of pagan governments to superstitious females. The good bishop, through inadvertence one would hope, instead of *superstitionis externæ*, in Tacitus, hath substituted, *novæ cujusdam religionis*, which words are indeed more for his purpose. Commentators have supposed, that this foreign superstition was christianity or judaism. But if Græcina accompanied her husband into Britain, it is more likely that the accusation related to the practice or approbation of some druidical ceremonies, which she observed there.

(c) Apudius Muræna.] It should be, *Apidius Merula:* The good bishop is unfortunate in his instance: *Merula* was struck off the list of senators, by the arbitrary act of the tyrant Tiberius, who was wholly managed by his favourite, Sejanus. And this act is brought by the historian as one proof, that the emperor the more obstinately persisted in his *inclemency*, (another word for *tyranny*) the more the Romans remonstrated against it. The other fact is, that he sent a woman into banishment, who had been legally tried and sentenced to a milder punishment. *Tacit.* Annal. iv. 42.

(d) They swore that they would keep their religion.] Sorry I am to remark here a gross misrepresentation, which cannot be accounted for by a supposed inadvertence or failure of memory. The words, *se religionem et ritus patrios retenturum*, are a very unfair interpolation of the bishop, to serve a cause, of which I will venture to say, he himself had no good opinion. Polydore Vergil's words are, *Item, teste Festo, lapidem silicem tenebant juraturi per Jovem, hæc verba loquentes; si sciens fallo, tum me Diespiter, salva urbe arceque, bonis ejiciat, ut ego hunc lapidem.* De invent. iv. 12, faithfully copied from his author Festus, and is no more than the form of the oath taken by those who swore by Jupiter, whatever the occasion or the object of the oath might be. Polydore, indeed says a little below, *Hunc pene morem pontifices nostri, reges, sacerdotes, prætores ac cæteri omnes præfecti servant qui ita jurant, antequam ad ea munera obeunda admittantur.* But surely these, even in Polydore's time, did not *hold a flint stone* in their hand when they swore; for he tells us that from the time of Justinian, the method of swearing was by laying the right hand upon the gospels, and saying, *ita me Deus, et hæc sancta evangelia juvent;* which is still the method of swearing in use among us, from the king to the petty constable, and, in many instances, where the religion and rites of the country never come in question. On the other hand (if we must have recourse to precedents from paganism, to justify customs which prevail under christianity) we learn from Festus, that it was not lawful for the Flamen Dialis to swear on any occasion. Aulus Gellius

gives us the prætor's perpetual edict to that purpose. *Sacerdotem Vestalem, et Flaminem Dialem in omni mea jurisdictione, jurare non cogam.* And Scaliger, upon this passage of Festus, quotes Livy (xxi in fine) where we read, that C. Valerius Flaccus being chosen Ædile, *quia Flamen Dialis erat, jurare in leges non poterat.* The reason of which Polydore Virgil gives as follows, *eo quod tormenti quoddam genus sit homini libero jusjurandum, præsertim sacerdoti, cui cum divina credita sint, parùm habere fidem absurdum censetur.* "Because an oath is a kind of a rack to an in-"genuous man, particularly to an ecclesiastic, whose good faith it "seems absurd to question, while things sacred and divine are intrus-"ted to him." He immediately adds, *Utinam* [hoc] *attenderent nostri magistratus, qui volunt, pro re etiam minima sacerdotes jurejurando adigere, cum iis imprimis illud tantum fari liceat, est, est, non, non.* "I wish our magistrates would consider this, "who require an oath from churchmen for every trifle, notwithstan-"ding it is incumbent upon *them* more especially to say nothing in "such cases, but yea, yea, nay, nay." If then we are to consider subscription, as bishop Taylor does, in the light of a *political* oath, and are to be governed by the wisdom of heathen legislators, we have in this precedent a strong argument against clerical subscriptions; unless it should be alledged that a christian minister is less to be trusted than a heathen priest. Or shall we say without regarding distinctions of times or systems,

Swear priests, and cowards, &c.

Forbid it decency! lest the reflection rebound, and bruise the imposer as well as the subscriber.

(e) This was more than ecclesiastical subscription; for that bound them to it for ever, this only gives witness—&c.] However this matter might be understood by this *sweet tempered bishop*, as Dr. Jortin called him, and others of his liberal turn, namely, that "ec-"clesiastical subscription, does not bind for ever;" yet such appears to be the case, even upon the principles he lays down in the subsequent parts of his discourse. "It may be very unfit," as the bishop says, "that we swear always to be of the same mind," but what is the consequence if the subscriber changes his mind, and revokes his assent to the article? So far, as the alledged purpose of subscription is concerned, he breaks the peace and unity of the church. If we go to the matter of fact, and apply the good bishop's rules to our own system, if there is any difference in the obligation between swearing or promising by subscription to obey the civil laws of our country, or swearing or subscribing assent to the religious doctrines or ceremonies which the church of England hath espoused and adopted, I apprehend the bond of ecclesiastical subscription will be found to be

ſtronger upon the ſubſcriber, than the obligation is upon him who promiſes upon oath to obey the municipal-law of his country, I mean in reſpect of future obedience. The ſubject ſwears to obſerve and obey the laws of his country, ſuch as they are at *preſent*. But the legiſlature of his country, if any of thoſe laws are found detrimental, oppreſſive, or otherwiſe inconvenient, may and often does alter or repeal thoſe laws, and that ſometimes upon the petition or remonſtrance of the ſubject; and ſo far as the ſubject had bound himſelf formerly to the laws then repealed, he is releaſed from the ſtrictneſs of his oath. But it has been alledged an hundred times, in the controverſy concerning ſubſcription, that the eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment of this kingdom is *unalterable;* and in proof of this, the king's coronation oath, and the act of union of the two kingdoms of England and Scotland, have been pleaded in bar of any alterations of our church forms. The conſequence is, that he that binds himſelf by his ſubſcription to the conſervation of peace and unity, binds himſelf to aſſent to theſe forms *for ever*. The argument, indeed for the unalterable perpetuity of theſe forms, founded upon the two topics juſt mentioned, is both falſe and fooliſh. But if this is the ſenſe of the ſupreme power (and that it is we ſhall ſee preſently) the ſubſcriber has no remedy; he becomes their ſlave for life; for as the biſhop ſays below, "whatever the ſubſcriber thinks himſelf, it is the intention of the impoſer that qualifies the ſubſcription." Biſhop Taylor, by many ſtriking paſſages in this ſhort diſcourſe, diſcovers his diſlike to the mode of eccleſiaſtical ſubſcription now in uſe, as well as to the impoſition of it. It was indeed impoſſible that the author of the excellent tract, intituled, *The liberty of propheſying*, ſhould not ſee the eſtabliſhment of human articles and forms of confeſſion in chriſtian churches, in all its iniquities. He therefore endeavours to take off the two great objections to the ſubſcription to them, the ſuppoſition of infallibility in the article, or, what is the ſame thing to the ſubſcriber, in the authority preſcribing aſſent to it; and "the direct ſhutting the "heart, by ſuch ſubſcription againſt all further clarity and manifeſtation of the truths of God." This he does by ſtating eccleſiaſtical ſubſcription, as "only giving of a *preſent* conſent, and binding only "to the conſervation of peace and unity, *for that time*." In which, one would think, he meant to be underſtood, that when the ſubſcriber, upon *further clarity*, ſaw cauſe to change his mind, or to revoke his aſſent, he was no longer bound by his ſubſcription, not even for the conſervation of peace and unity.

But if this was biſhop Taylor's meaning, he certainly ran counter both to the law of the land, and the diſcipline of the church. For it was determined on a certain occaſion by all the judges of England, that the ſubſcription to the articles was *abſolute*, and not *conditional*, that is to ſay, without the condition, *ſo far forth as the articles are agreeable to the word of God;* and by the ſame judgment, the ſub-

ſcriber's *private opinion*, who ſhould take ſome of them to be againſt the word of God, is expreſsly excluded; "becauſe," as the judgment goes on, "by this means," i. e. by admitting the condition, "diverſity of opinions ſhould not be avoided, which was the ſcope "of the ſtatute, and the very act itſelf touching ſubſcription, made of "none effect." [See Dr. Bennet's Eſſay on the 39 articles, chap. xxxiii.] Which ſtatute thus interpreted admits not of the leaſt relaxation of the ſubſcriber's obligation in future, ſince from the moment the ſubſcriber profeſſes *a diverſity of opinion*, he becomes amenable, and liable to the penalties of the ſtatute, as a breaker of the peace of the church. The xxxviiith canon alſo, pronounces ſentence of excommunication upon revolters after ſubſcription, and, without ſubmiſſion, after two months, abſolute deprivation. What meaning have theſe laws, if ſubſcription is not intended to fix the ſubſcriber's aſſent for all time coming?

(f) Such articles ought not to be made, unleſs they of themſelves are neceſſary and plain by a divine commandment.] But if an article ought not to be made, and for this reaſon, becauſe it is not neceſſary and plain by a divine commandment, no human power hath a competent authority to make it. It is no matter how *uſeful* it may be for certain political purpoſes; if the truth or neceſſity of it are not plain by a divine commandment, ſuch article *ought not to be made*. "For," as the biſhop ſays, "if God hath not commanded us to believe it, no human power can command us to profeſs it." The church of Rome, indeed, pretending to infallibility, may, under that pretence, make articles totally unſupported by ſcripture proof, as neceſſary to be both believed and profeſſed by divine commandment. But biſhop Taylor was a proteſtant, and diſclaimed the pretence; and whatever high opinion he might entertain of the authority of the church of England to fabricate divine commandments, he could not, in this caſe, and at the time he wrote this book, avail himſelf of the church's authority, after he had ſtated "ſubſcriptions to articles and "forms of confeſſion to be *wholly* of political conſideration;" for the ſecret of an alliance between church and ſtate had not *then* tranſpired. The quotation from Melancthon in the next paragraph, approved by the biſhop, implies a limitation of political power to ſuch injunctions as men would be obliged to obey, though the political power did not interpoſe, meaning in religious matters; that is to ſay (applying the aphoriſm as the good biſhop applies it, to ſubſcription) to the eſtabliſhment of ſuch propoſitions only, as we are obliged to believe by divine commandment. But the misfortune is, the unhappy ſubſcriber is not permitted to debate with the civil power, whether ſuch and ſuch articles *ought* to have been made? but to conſider what he is to do, now they *are* made. The good biſhop ſays that "ſubſcription ought to be ſo intended, that he who hath "ſubſcribed, may not perceive himſelf taken in a ſnare." The

worthy prelate meant, honeſtly, that in requiring ſubſcription, there ſhould be no appearance of guile or deceit. But all the defenders of ſubſcription, from old Thomas Rogers, down to Powell, Rutherforth, Balguy, και των καθεξης, have turned the inſtruction another way, and employed their caſuiſtry, not to ſhew that *no ſnare is intended*, but to prevent, as far as was poſſible, the ſimple ſubſcriber from *perceiving* it.

This limitation, taken together with biſhop Taylor's poſition, that *articles and confeſſions* are wholly of *political* conſideration, will undoubtedly operate equally againſt forms of worſhip, and every thing eſtabliſhed by merely civil authority, and indeed againſt every thing of the religious kind, eſtabliſhed upon pretence of public utility, which has not the clear warrant of the divine appointment.

(g) If the peace of the church be ſafe without the article.] The terms, *peace and unity*, *public peace*, *public need*, *temporal regards*, &c. aſſigned by the biſhop as legitimate grounds for requiring ſubſcription, terminate all of them here in *the peace of the church*. Innumerable have been the impoſtures in all ages occaſioned by the equivocal uſe of words. What is the peace of the church? Can any man define it better than the apoſtle has done; namely, that ſtate of the church, wherein the members of the church *lead quiet and peaceable lives in all godlineſs and honeſty*; which they may very well do, and yet entertain very different opinions concerning human articles and confeſſions of faith of man's device. The apoſtle we ſee, throws the proviſions for this peace and quietneſs into the hands of the civil magiſtrate; and if the civil magiſtrate cannot provide for the peace and quiet of his ſubjects by the execution of wholeſome laws upon the offenders againſt them, it would be a curious diſcovery in politics, to find out how it might be done by exacting ſubſcription to an artificial ſyſtem of theological propoſitions. We may therefore ſafely conclude, that any thing of this kind eſtabliſhed for aſſent or belief, beyond the divine commandment, is neither *neceſſary* nor *uſeful*, becauſe the peace of the church may be ſecured without it. If indeed you take the peace of the church to mean, (what the advocates for ſubſcription always ſuppoſe it to mean) a perfect and unlimited ſubmiſſion to the dictates of the rulers of the church, or, in the biſhop's language, of the ſupreme powers, then every thing will be uſeful and neceſſary to ſecure the peace of the church, which tends to ſecure the ruling powers in the peaceable enjoyment of their dominion. But to complete this ſort of peace, I queſtion whether ſubſcription to church articles, or any thing indeed ſhort of the Spaniſh inquiſition would be ſufficient. The principle called conſcience, informed by due examination, and regulated by the divine commandment, will be apt, perhaps, to conſider this dominion of the ſupreme powers, in the light of uſurpation, and treat it accordingly. And therefore till theſe powers can eſtabliſh an abſolute controul over the

conſciences of their ſubjects, the peace of the church, in the ſenſe above-mentioned, can never be ſecured; and in that caſe only can the exacting ſubſcription to articles and confeſſions, beyond the divine commandment, be either *neceſſary* or *uſeful*.

(h) Then the conformity is as uſeful to peace, as the ſentence and determination was.] In order to underſtand biſhop Taylor's meaning in this paragraph, it will be neceſſary to conſider the conteſted article or point of doctrine in diſpute (as indeed the biſhop ſeems to conſider it) *before* it has received the deciſion or ſentence of the ſupreme power. Before that be done, each party of the diſputants is, in the biſhop's idea, a faction; and conſequently the deciders of the queſtion eſpouſe a faction and become abettors of it. But how neceſſary or uſeful ſoever the conformity of the oppoſite faction may be to procure peace, the expedient of *deciding* the point, is very unlikely to procure ſuch conformity, even upon the biſhop's own ſtate of the caſe. For his lordſhip does not make the conformity required to depend upon the force or authority of the ſentence, but upon the conformiſts belief that the article thus decided by the ſupreme power is true. This is clearly to put the conformity upon the iſſue of the man's private judgment; and if he refuſes his aſſent upon a perſuaſion, that the article is not true, it is not the ſentence (the man's integrity being preſuppoſed) that will induce him to ſubſcribe to it, nor conſequently is the ſentence uſeful for the peace of the church.

(i) When articles are eſtabliſhed without neceſſity, ſubſcription muſt be required without tyranny and imperiouſneſs, that is, it muſt be left to the liberty of the ſubject to profeſs or not to profeſs that doctrine.] We muſt here again be careful that we do not miſunderſtand the good biſhop. Articles eſtabliſhed without neceſſity may mean either articles not neceſſary by divine commandment, or articles not neceſſary from any temporal regards either to peace and unity, or any of thoſe purpoſes of public welfare for which ſubſcription is ſuppoſed by the biſhop, to be required on a merely political account. The biſhop's hypotheſis ſeems to allow the ſupreme power an authority to eſtabliſh ſuch articles at all events; for the proviſo, that they do not encroach upon truth or conſcience, does not ſeem to be inſerted to limit the authority of the ſupreme powers, but only as an admonition to exerciſe their authority with moderation; or, as it is here expreſſed, "without tyranny and imperiouſneſs." He might poſſibly mean, that the ſupreme powers might eſtabliſh articles, which, abſtracted from their *truth*, or any abſolute *neceſſity* to eſtabliſh them, would be politically *uſeful* (a diſtinction which his lordſhip appears to have adopted above) and might be aſſented to *as ſuch only*, by the ſubſcriber; and yet we ſee theſe unneceſſary articles turn out to be articles of *doctrine*, to the truth or falſehood of which ſurely ſome regard ſhould be had, if it is only on account of its *uſefulneſs*. Shall we ſay that the good biſhop allows the ſubſcriber to ſubſcribe his aſ-

ſent to doctrines which *(cum permiſſu ſuperiorum)* he is at liberty to profeſs or not to profeſs? But I ſhould think, if the ſubſcriber is a man of conſcience, that after he has written his *lubens et ex animo ſubſcripſi*, to the articles, he has taken away his own liberty of profeſſing or not profeſſing the doctrine contained in it; that is to ſay, of profeſſing or not profeſſing his belief of it. For to ſay, I ſubſcribe my aſſent to ſuch a doctrine upon account of its uſefulneſs, though I do not profeſs to believe it, is a contemptible prevarication, to which I ſhould very unwillingly think ſo good and pious a man as Dr. Jeremy Taylor would give countenance. I conſider him therefore, all along in this diſcourſe, as accommodating his caſuiſtry to the times, and the irremediable errors and abſurdities of the church eſtabliſhment, as it then ſtood. He found the doctrine of abſolute ſubmiſſion to the ſupreme civil powers, to be the doctrine of the day; he knew likewiſe that to lodge the ſupreme power of requiring ſubſcription in the church, would imply the infallibility of the church. He therefore ſtated ſubſcription to be wholly of political conſideration, upon the ſuppoſition that the civil powers might do many things on political conſiderations, and under the notion of public good, which were not ſtrictly warranted by the word of God. It does not ſeem to have occurred to him, that the civil magiſtrate, being *chriſtian*, is as much limited in religious matters, and matters pertaining to conſcience, by the divine commandment, as the eccleſiaſtical. He ſays indeed, that "if God hath not commanded us to believe an article of doctrine, no "human power can command us to profeſs it." But this, taken along with the words at the head of this note, only tends to confirm the ſuſpicion, that the biſhop made a diſtinction between an authority to command ſubſcription of *aſſent* to articles of doctrine for the ſake of peace or public good, and an authority to command the ſubſcriber to *profeſs* his belief of the doctrines contained in it. A wretched kind of ſophiſtry, adopted, I am afraid, too inadvertently and raſhly by ſuch ſubſcribers among us, as conſider the articles as *articles of peace only*, and a wretched expedient to provide for peace at the expence of truth and good faith. But the eſtabliſhment ſtands as it did in biſhop Taylor's time, and if he underſtood the thing in this light, why may not we?' which would be an excellent apology, if nobody had written any thing upon the ſubject ſince biſhop Taylor's time. If I remember right, (for I have not the book at hand) there is a letter in the life of the late Dr. Lardner, from the late Archbiſhop Secker, to that worthy man, diſapproving of ſomething the doctor has ſaid in an excellent diſcourſe on ſubſcription, in one of the volumes of his *Credibility*, &c. His grace was there of opinion that "doctrines may be *uſeful*, which are not neceſſary." I cite the paſſage by memory, but his words, I am pretty ſure, are to that effect. Things of that kind are eaſily thrown out and look plauſible, till they are brought to the teſt of fact. If Archbiſhop Secker had

ſat down at the time he wrote to Dr. Lardner, to prove the uſefulneſs of ſubſcription to unneceſſary, uncertain, and perchance falſe articles of religion, and were to have had no farther preferment in the church till he had demonſtrated his propoſition, I am afraid the church muſt have wanted the edification ſhe received from his prudent government for ſo many years.

(k) And when there is no neceſſity of faith, no public need to be ſerved, &c.] The neceſſity of faith ſeems to be confined above, to the divine commandment, and the ſtate-neceſſity, or public good of requiring ſubſcription, is made, by the biſhop, to ariſe from the obligation upon the ſupreme power to govern and rule in peace; and hence likewiſe the obligation of the ſubject to comply with the civil power, when required to ſubſcribe, is ſaid to ariſe; qualified however with a proviſo, that the ſubſcriber believes that the article to be ſubſcribed, is true. Let us ſuppoſe then that he is otherwiſe perſuaded; What is the magiſtrate to do? The neceſſity upon him is ſuppoſed to be the quelling a faction, by making an article deciſive of a queſtion which divides the parties, and injoining ſubſcription to it by both for the ſake of peace. But they who are perſuaded that the article is *not* true, will not ſubſcribe, nor indeed, even in biſhop Taylor's opinion, ought they, on the peril of being guilty of hypocriſy. Shall the magiſtrate ſuffer the recuſants to enjoy their opinion without moleſtation on his part? The faction then remains, it is not quelled, and peace is not reſtored. Shall he puniſh the recuſants, by bringing calamity upon them? No, for this is a direct ſtate of perſecution, the offspring of *fond perſuaſion, indiſcrete zeal, and uſurped empire over men's conſciences.* For whatever the ſupreme powers may think of the orthodoxy of their article, thus will a faction of recuſants think of it, particularly if their recuſancy brings calamity upon them; and they will have as much right and reaſon ſo to think, as the magiſtrate will have to impute their recuſancy to prejudice and perverſeneſs, which is the only plauſible cauſe he can have for inflicting calamity upon them.

(l) In which caſes the eccleſiaſtical state hath no power to give commandments.] That is to ſay, in caſes, where there is no neceſſity of faith, (or no divine commandment) or no public need to be ſerved. I apprehend this amounts to a total excluſion of the eccleſiaſtical ſtate from *all* power, or participation of power in injoining ſubſcription beyond the divine commandment. For if ſubſcription to articles and forms of confeſſion be wholly of political conſideration, the civil ſtate muſt of courſe be the *only* judge when public need is, or is not ſerved by ſubſcription. This the church would think ſhe had no reaſon to take well at the biſhop's hands, and hath indeed loudly remonſtrated againſt ſuch excluſion in former times; and where her diſcontent might have ended who can tell, if an expedient of reconciliation had not, about forty years ago, been projected and

publiſhed in the famous book of alliance between church and ſtate? by which it appears (without any formal ratification, however, on the part of the ſtate) that in all caſes of public utility to be derived from religion, the church is taken in as co-operatrix. Biſhop Taylor, God knows, underſtood the church and the ſtate to act in two diſtinct departments, and ſaw no abſurdity in ſuppoſing, that the civil ſtate might oblige men to ſuffer calamity for conſcience ſake without the aid of the church.

(m) Giving his hand to public peace, and keeping his conſcience for God.] The biſhop has argued this point extremely well upon the queſtion as he hath ſtated it. But I am apt to believe, that not one in five hundred who ſubſcribe *our* articles without believing them, mean to accommodate the church with their ſubſcription, as an expedient of peace. The peace of the church, is, generally ſpeaking, a matter of very inferior conſideration to him who is in danger of ſtarving if he is not admitted into it. The truer ſtate of the queſtion therefore, in my apprehenſion, would be, whether a man may lawfully ſubſcribe what he does not believe, *to avoid calamity?* Surely no wiſe or righteous government would entertain the abſurd idea of ſecuring the public peace by proſtituting the conſciences of its ſubjects. Neither, will you ſay, would any wiſe and righteous government think of ſecuring the public peace by perſecuting its ſubjects. I grant it. Some governments, however, have eſteemed themſelves wiſe and righteous to an extreme, in perſecuting their ſubjects for not ſubſcribing to eccleſiaſtical forms, which the conſciences of thoſe ſubjects could not digeſt, and among the reſt, our own in conſequence of the Bartholomew act; which, we have been informed by very conſequential characters, and not quite an age ago, was moſt wiſely fabricated to ſecure the peace of the church. But our government, it is alledged, is grown more wiſe and more righteous in adopting a ſpirit of toleration, and diſavowing all thoughts of perſecution. Be it ſo. They have diſavowed the word. But *my* word and biſhop Taylor's is *calamity*, and not *perſecution*; and if I know myſelf, I ſhall never be of opinion with the *unfeeling* defenders of ſubſcription, preſent or paſt, that an honeſt man who is deprived of his ſubſiſtence, and is ſent to ſeek it *in deſolate places*, becauſe he cannot comply with an unrighteous impoſition, ſuffers *no calamity*. As the law ſtands now, and as the compliances with it fall under common obſervation, it is no breach of charity to ſuppoſe, that ninety-nine out of an hundred of thoſe who ſubſcribe againſt their conſciences, or without ſeriouſly debating the matter with their conſciences, do it rather to ſecure a competent maintenance, or a ſtation of reſpect and dignity, ſo called, than from any regard to the peace of the church; of which few men of ſenſe entertain the falſe and inconſiſtent idea, that the defenders of ſubſcription are daily endeavouring to obtrude upon us. Whether biſhop Taylor would have allowed more

indulgence to this, than he does to the far leſs ſubſtantial plea he mentions, cannot now be known. As his argument is managed, he ſeems to have left no room in any caſe for that evaſive caſuiſtry, that allows a man to ſubſcribe his aſſent to doctrines, which he neither believes, nor thinks himſelf obliged by his ſubſcription to profeſs.

(n) Of either of which, if eccleſiaſtical laws be guilty, they are not for edification, but are neither juſt nor pious, and therefore oblige not.] That is, if ſuch laws either afflict good men, or tempt them to hypocriſy, by rigorouſly requiring ſubſcriptions to articles which are not evidently true, and neceſſary to be profeſſed. Theories and hypotheſes are of little weight till they are brought to the teſt of fact. Let us try the biſhop's argument by applying it to our thirty-nine articles. There may be men among us who will be hardy enough to affirm, that all of them are *true*, and *neceſſary* to be profeſſed. Many good men, however, of ſound judgment, and inflexible integrity, have refuſed to ſubſcribe them, upon very ſolid objections to the *truth* of ſome of them, and to the *neceſſity* of others. And it is very credible, that numbers of others, eſpecially of the younger ſort, ſubſcribe them without examining them, and perhaps without being capable of examining them. I ſay this after biſhop Burnet, who was a very competent judge. Several of thoſe who have refuſed to ſubſcribe them have expreſſed their affliction, that they ſhould, by ſuch refuſal, be excluded from exerciſing a function in which it was their hearts deſire to be employed, and have ſuffered calamity in being deprived of the means of procuring a competent maintenance in the only way in which they are qualified to earn it. Now if theſe men are not afflicted and diſtreſſed by the eccleſiaſtical laws which require ſubſcription to the thirty-nine articles, and if the other ſort are not by the ſame laws tempted to hypocriſy, then theſe laws rigorouſly requiring ſuch ſubſcription are both juſt and pious, and the two biſhops Taylor and Burnet have been ſtating caſes, and reproving practices with which the church of England hath no concern.

(o) The next good thing to the not impoſing uncertain and unneceſſary articles, is, that great regard be had, and great eaſe be done to wiſe and peaceable diſſenters.] The very beſt thing then, is not to impoſe ſuch articles; nor indeed is it very eaſy to ſee what thoſe *temporal regards* are, that can require it, unleſs it be to throw more power into the hands of what is called the ſupreme authority than the divine commandment hath given it. But when ſuch articles are eſtabliſhed, and ſubſcription to them is impoſed, what eaſe can you poſſibly give to diſſenters? They are not permitted to ſubſcribe *conditionally*, or *with limitation;* they muſt ſubſcribe *abſolutely*, or their ſubſcription is null and void; and the alternative is, an abſolute excluſion from the temporal benefits and privileges of their fellow chriſtians who comply with the impoſition. The biſhop

probably means, that they shall be permitted to live with their noses unslit, and their ears uncropped, or not be too severely fined, or too long imprisoned. "And is not this a great ease," will the advocate for subscription say "in comparison of what the dissenters suffered "in the days of the Stuarts? not to mention the toleration act, which "permits them to worship in their own way in separate congregati-"ons?" Yes, the toleration-act must be mentioned, for the toleration-act affords them no relief unless they subscribe articles, in their opinion, both *uncertain* and *unnecessary*. Without that qualification, they are still liable to all the *canonical*, and to many of the *civil* penalties ordained by law for the suppression of schismatics, conventicles, &c. particularly fine and imprisonment. And indeed, allowing the moderation and lenity of the church of England in its utmost extent, the occasions of affliction, and the temptations to hypocrisy, still remain, which, I presume, have no tendency to secure "the spiritual "interest of souls and truth." In the foregoing paragraph the bishop had said, that, "in the division of hearts that is in the world, some "good men may dissent." Had the good man said, as he certainly meant, "division of judgments," his argument would have been more explicit. In the common acceptation of words, there may be division of judgments where there is no division of hearts. All the powers upon earth cannot effect an union of judgments, but an union of hearts there certainly may be, where every man is allowed the free exercise of his private judgment in matters of conscience; for the same conscience which obliges me to differ from any good man in a point of doctrine, obliges me to *receive him as a brother*, and not to treat him as an *enemy;* and every man who behaves himself with godliness and honesty, and does not transgress the civil laws of his country, ought to be in my estimation, a good man. There is no necessity that any individual should hate or molest another because that other is of a different judgment from himself. On the contrary, it is sinful and presumptuous, to treat him as an *enemy*, merely on that account. But every man who suffers calamity or affliction, that is, on whom they are inflicted by the civil powers, because of his not subscribing his assent to articles which appear to him to be *uncertain* or *unnecessary*, is treated as an enemy, that is to say, as an enemy to the peace of the church, or to public peace, and on that supposition, a *wise* and *good* dissenter there may be, in the eye of reason and christianity; but in the eye of politic power, a *peaceable* dissenter is a nonentity. And for the ease of an unpeaceable dissenter, no provision ought to be made. Who or what is it that gives the powers that be, civil or ecclesiastical, the power thus to infringe the laws of christianity in a christian country? None of the defenders of such assumed authority, have condescended to inform us on what competent authority it is founded; and in this particular the good bishop,

much as it concerned the queſtion he debated, has left us ſhort. The policy indeed, of impoſing ſuch articles, be the pretence what you will, ſeems to be no more commendable than the righteouſneſs of it. Take away ſubſcription to uncertain and unneceſſary articles, and to all articles which are not *a priori*, neceſſary and plain by divine commandment; and all the diſſent will be among individuals, one of whom hath no more right to decide than another; and there will be no peace broken, unleſs ſome audacious and turbulent fellow attempts to cudgel his antagoniſt into an aſſent to his private opinions; and then it is the bruiſer that breaks the peace, and thereby becomes the proper object of the coercion of the civil powers; and his puniſhment ſo far effectually reſtores the peace of the community. But if the ſupreme powers take up the cudgels, the peace is broken on their part, and is not likely to be reſtored while there is one diſſenter in the community. The plain truth is, all the difficulties in the biſhop's political conſideration of the ſubject, ariſe from the indeterminate manner in which he hath ſtated the authority of the ſupreme powers. If you aſk, have the ſupreme powers authority to impoſe ſubſcription to uncertain and unneceſſary articles of faith? He ſeems (with his heathen authorities in view) to anſwer, "yes, when there is a "public need to be ſerved, and for certain temporal regards." But recollecting that he was writing where the chriſtian religion was profeſſed, he limits this authority with a condition, that, "the ſpiritual "intereſt of ſouls, and of truth" (matters, which, with reſpect to the ſubſcriber, are of private conſideration) "be ſecured." But neither the intereſt of ſouls nor of truth can be ſecured, under an obligation to ſubſcribe unneceſſary and uncertain articles of faith; and ſo there is an end of the political power to impoſe them. And thus this worthy biſhop, takes back with *one* hand, what he had given with the *other*, leaving the advantage however, upon the whole, in the ſcale of truth and chriſtian liberty; contrary to the caſuiſtry of our modern church champions, who having weighed *truth* againſt *utility*, find the latter to preponderate, by virtue of having the influence of the eccleſiaſtical ſtate added to, and combined with the authority of the political.

(p) It cannot ſerve the ends of truth, and holineſs, and chriſtian ſimplicity.] This is ſaid of that *latitude of ſenſe* with which articles are ſo made that ſubſcribers may aſſent to the *ſame form of words, in what ſenſe they pleaſe, which the truth of God will ſuffer, and the words can be capable of.* This the biſhop calls *the laſt remedy* or expedient for reconciling men of different judgments in ſubſcribing articles, otherwiſe neither neceſſary nor certain. *Neceſſary* ſuch articles cannot be to prevent *diverſity* of *opinions*, if the words are made to admit *diverſity* of *ſenſes*, and *certain* they cannot be, if they repreſent the truth of God as *equivocal* and *indeterminate*,

This therefore, the good man honeſtly and juſtly calls, "the worſt remedy." And yet this ſuppoſed laxity of expreſſion in the thirty-nine articles of the church of England, has been boaſted of as her perfection and glory, and a teſtimony of her moderation in compariſon of the rigor of other proteſtant churches. But if this remedy cannot ſerve "the ends of truth, and holineſs, and chriſtian ſimpli-"city," it can only ſerve the ends of falſehood, hypocriſy, and unchriſtian duplicity. For the pretence for exacting ſubſcription to theſe articles is, "to prevent diverſity of opinions," and the pretence of the ſubſcriber is, his agreement with *all* his fellow-ſubſcribers in that ſyſtem of doctrine to which, by that act, he declares his voluntary and cordial aſſent. Thus he is underſtood by the impoſers, and thus he muſt be underſtood by all honeſt men who know the import of his declaration, and know of no eſpecial diſpenſation he has to prevaricate. In the mean time it may be queſtioned whether there is in fact this latitude of ſenſes in the thirty-nine articles or not. It is next to certain that the compilers of thoſe articles did not intend to leave any room for it; and if the learned and excellent Dr. Clarke was not the firſt that found ſuch latitude of ſenſes in them, he was the firſt that laid any conſiderable ſtreſs upon it, ſupporting his opinion of the expedience of making uſe of it, upon the ſuppoſition, that otherwiſe the proteſtant church of England muſt be underſtood to profeſs herſelf infallible. But if this way of arguing is admiſſible, I am afraid it will tend to reprobate ſome other more conſequential parts of her eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment, where no latitude is pretended, or can be pleaded, as wholly inconſiſtent with the genuine principles of the proteſtant religion. But beſides the implicit condemnation of this latitude of ſenſes, biſhop Taylor we ſee, makes it queſtionable whether it will procure *peace* and *external charity*, and what he calls *phantaſtic concord*, or in his expreſſion, ſerve the ends of them? Fact and experience convince us that it will not. It is certain, that there are among us a ſet of divines who aſſert one fixed orthodox ſenſe of each article from which the ſubſcriber may not ſwerve; and if this is not the belief of the ſupreme powers, it is certain they are offended with thoſe who diſpute it, and advance any other, though under colour that it is not contrary to the terms of the article. Hence *wrath, anger, clamour, and evil-ſpeaking*, the common fruits of theological controverſy, nor will the plea of a privilege of underſtanding the words of an article in a ſenſe they will very well bear, ſcreen the obnoxious man from the reproach of *heretic*, *ſchiſmatic*, and mover of ſedition. Read a few pages in a book, intituled *Ophiomaches*, written by one Dr. *Skelton*, and believe if you can, that the church enjoys the peace the ſupreme powers intended to procure for her, by requiring ſubſcription to articles and forms of confeſſion. And ſo much for *peace*. External charity is an ex-

preſſion to which it is difficult to fix a preciſe idea. If it ſtands for no more than a mere toleration; *that* we know is now extended to thoſe who do not ſubſcribe the articles in any ſenſe. And how far the orthodox are willing to ſhew even an external charity to latitudinarian ſubſcribers, may be known by conſulting the abovementioned Dr. Skelton and an hundred others of his complexion. The peace, the charity, the concord, whoſe ends are ſaid to be ſerved by this laxity of ſenſe, are therefore all equally *phantaſtic*, merely ideal, and productive of nothing but a fooliſh ſubſtitution of the plauſible vizard of ſophiſtry, inſtead of the open, honeſt, and undiſguiſed countenance of TRUTH and COMMON SENSE.

FINIS.

[*Printed by B Flower, Cambridge.*]

INDEX.

*** *The pages signified by* numerals, *refer to the* Memoirs *and* Appendix. Vol. I.

A

ABBOT, Archbp. vindicated from the charge of inſtigating King James to oppoſe Vorſtius, vol. v. p. 387, *note*. Apology for his conduct with regard to Grotius, v. p. 388, *note*. Inquiry into his ſentiments with reſpect to the edict of the States, relating to the Gomariſts and Arminians, v, 391, *note*.

Abraham, Iſaac, &c. how they live in a ſeparate ſtate, according to Beauſobre and Lenfant, ii, 329, *note*.

Aquinas, his opinion of the Soul, iii, 57.

Act, for naturalizing the Jews repealed: not to be imputed to the ſeverity of the Chriſtian religion, *i*, 249. Five-mile, in favour of what, ii, 175. Of Uniformity, what enjoins, *ibid*.

Adam, the diſtinction between the Life of the Soul and Body, iii, 33, *note*. Melchior, his opinion of Luther, iii. 26, *note*.

Adams, Mr. his anſwer to Hume, quoted and commended, i, 126.

Addiſon, Dr. Lancelot, his hiſtories of the Jews and Mohammedans referred to, iv, 289.

Addreſs, candid, to the Jews, object of, i, 240.

Ἅδης, ſaid to ſignify always in the New Teſtament, the place of ſeparate ſpirits, ii, 240.

Albigenſes, defended from the charge of the hereſy of the Manichæans, iv, 219, *note*. Held the tenets of the firſt Reformers, iv, 220, *note*. Rejected the hereſies of the church of Rome, and on that account the inquiſition was inſtituted. *ibid*.

Alexander, Mr. John, his criticiſm on 1 Cor. xv, 44. iii, 129. *note*.

Andrews, Biſhop of Wincheſter, his retort on Neale Biſhop of Durham, v, 507, *note*.

Angels, whether they have bodies, iv, 280, *note*.

Anne, Queen, plots during her reign, iv, 85, *note*. The four laſt years of her reign appealed to, vii, 65.

Apthorp, Mr. obſervations on a paſſage in his Review of Dr. Mayhew's Remarks, &c. relating to the Confeſſional, v, 91. Preface to 1ſt. edit. His zeal in promoting an epiſcopal eſtabliſhment in America, ii, 58.

Aquinas, Thomas, Accounts for the origin of ideas, iii, 164.
Arminianiſm, tends to leſſen the differences between Proteſtants and Papiſts, v, 119. Preface to 1ſt. edit. gains ground in the Church of England, v, 398, 413, Slaviſh tendency of, v, 415.
Arnauld, Mr. is enraged againſt Gaſſendi, iii, 120.
Articles, Church, xxi. How underſtood by Mr. Rogers, i, 155. Church, ought to be conſidered and amended, i, 197. Subſcription to, by thoſe who diſbelieve them a diſgrace to the church, ii, 123. Biſhop's, upon what occaſion compiled, v, 377, *note*. Of the Church of England, how far ſubſcription to them is required by 13 Eliz. c. 12. v. Preface to 2 edit. p. 23. The limiting clauſe in that ſtatute, not abrogated by the Act of Uniformity, 14 Car. ii. v, 2, 6, *note*. Bp. Burnet's motives for expounding them, v, p. 214. The propriety of eſtabliſhing, as a ſtandard of doctrines, objected to by Bp. Burnet, v, 225. The uſe of according to Bp. Burnet, v, 250. Hiſtory of King James's Declaration prefixed to them, v, 258. Are accepted by a ſolemn vow of the Houſe of Commons, in the reign of King Charles I. v. 265. Objections to Bp. Burnet's Account of the firſt publication of them, v, 146. No latitude of general terms employed in them, v. 344. The form of ſubſcription required to them, v, 354. The Clergy charged with departing from them, v, 355, *note*. Subſcription to, a total reſignation of the right of private judgment, v, 356, How eſtabliſhed in Ireland, v, 359, *note*. Arminianiſm, the general perſuaſion of the preſent ſubſcribers, v, 413. Dr. Heylin's opinion of the compilers of them, v, 423, *note*. The Calviniſtical Articles conſidered as the ſtrongeſt barriers againſt popery, v, 427. A reform of them neceſſary, v, 449. The firſt clauſe of the twentieth Article of ſuſpicious authority, v, 460, *note*. Subſcription agreeable to the office of ordination, ſufficient ſecurity for the principles of churchmen, without the additional ſubſcription to theſe, v, 509—10. Latitude in, vi, 78. 39, compared to rye-wigs, vii, 66, *note*. A 40th. propoſed, vii, 73. 39, a demonſtration of the truth of in the Gentleman's Magazine, vii, 212. 39, contain a great many diſtinct propoſitions, vii, 310. According to Rogers they contain 136 propoſitions, *ibid*. Should not be publicly oppoſed, vii, 324. Eſtabliſhed without neceſſity, ſhould imply ſubſcription without imperiouſneſs, vii, 328—341. With great latitude of ſenſe, cannot ſerve the ends of truth, &c. vii, 333, 347.
Aſhby de la Zouch, letter from, iv, 180.
Aſſes, who ſo denominated, iii, 17, *note*.
Athanaſian Creed, Dr. Waterland's ſentiments on the damnatory clauſes, v. 313. An account of thoſe who have oppoſed this

Creed ſince the commencement of the preſent (laſt) century, v, 487.
Augſburgh, Confeſſion of, iii, 78. The Confeſſion of, the precedent for other proteſtant ſtates, in forming confeſſions of faith, v. 151.
Auſtin, St. his account of a Roman Senator, vii, 331.
Authority, the civil magiſtrates in matters of religion never properly canvaſſed, between the reigns of Henry VIII. to the ſettlement under King William, iv, 389. Muſt be limited by the laws of Chriſt, iv, 390. Church, a diſcretionary exerciſe of it, not juſtified by expedience, v. 179. Its right of deciding in points of faith, interferes with the right of private judgment, v, 186.
Avery, Mr. his application to the miniſter to lay aſide the project of ſending biſhops to America, ii, 71. Very active in the cauſe, ii, 74.

B

Bacon Roger, and Moſes compared, ii, 411. One of the firſt who felt the incumbrance of ſuperſtition, iii, 13.
Baker Sir Rich. his account of the ſettlements in Virginia, vi, 244.
Balguy, Dr. his ſermon at the conſecration of the Bp. of Llandaff referred to, iv, 342. *note*. His charge referred to, iv, 264. Confeſſes that church authority is not to be found in the ſcriptures, Advertiſement, v, 7. Says, men conſult the ſcripture for what is not to be found in it, viz. an accurate deſcription of their rights and duties, vi, 323, *note*. Extends no compaſſion to miniſters of the church, who live at open war with it, vi, 347, *note*.
Bancroft, Archbp. his Amendment of Archbp. Parker's explanation of the regal ſupremacy over the church, v, 382. Oppoſes the alterations in the articles propoſed by Dr. Reynolds, at Hampton-court conference, v, 383. A perſecutor of the Puritans, vi, 244.
Barbadoes, eccleſiaſtical commiſſary of, his infamous conduct, ii, 59, *note*.
Barbeyrac, his character of the Fathers of the Chriſtian church, v, 496.
Barlow, Bp. his opinion of the Homilies of the church of England, v, 306.
Baron, a Jacobine friar, his defence of St. Thomas Aquinas, againſt John de Launois, Preface to 1 edit. v. 61. Mr. R. re-publiſhes Mr. Blackburne's attack on Bp. Butler, i, xix.
Barretti, his work on the manners and cuſtoms of Italy referred to,

iv, 244, *note*. His character of the learned men of Italy, Preface to 1 edit. v, 125, *note*. His own superſtition, ditto, v. *ib. note*.

Barrow, Dr. contends that the ancient Hebrews had no name appropriated to the place of ſouls, iii, 297, *note*. Subſcribes the engagement, and afterwards prevails to have his name ſtruck out, v, 444, *note*.

Baxter, his opinion of the ſoul, iii. 62. Richard, his Liturgy ſcrutinized by the Savoy biſhops, vii, 137.

Bayle, M. his hiſtory of Calviniſm quoted, i, 146. His Apology for Pomponatius, iii, 86. His opinion of the Brevis Diſquiſitio, iii, 112. His Dictionary quoted, iii, 18, *note*. His reflection on Mr. Claude, iii, 25. His opinion of Maimbourg, iii, 49. His remarks on the controverſy between Baron and John de Launois, concerning the merits of St. Thomas Aquinas, Preface to 1 edit. v, 61. Gives inſtances of the bad ſucceſs of reformers, ditto, 63.

Bedell, Bp. his Apology for ſome who continued in the church of Rome, iv, 283, *note*.

Bennet, Dr. an examination of his expoſition of the Articles of the church of England, v, 296. Compared with that of Dr. Nicholls, v, 303. His opinion of the Athanaſian creed, vi, 205.

Berington, Mr. brings a charge againſt Mr. Blackburne with regard to the number of Papiſts, lviii.

Bible, when firſt tranſlated into Engliſh, read with incredible avidity, iv, 99.

Bigotry, Popiſh, the effects of, among the common people, iv, 72, *note*.

Binckes, Dr. ſome account of his attack on Bp. Burnet's Expoſition of the thirty-nine Articles, v, 275.

Biographia Britannica referred to, ii, 72. The compilers of Mr. Locke's life cenſured, iii, 212.

Birmingham, a letter from on the increaſe of Popery, iv, 71, *note*.

Biſhop, a, Advice from to a young clergyman, vii, 229. A Letter to, occaſioned by a late petition to Parliament, vii, 243.

Biſhops, their declaration againſt the rebellion, quoted, i, 161. Moravian, eſtabliſhed in America, ii, 43. Eaſtern, pleaded poverty as an excuſe for not attending the council in Italy, iii, 52, *note*. How they loſt their epiſcopal authority in the reign of Charles I. Preface to 1 edit. v. 80. They agree to publiſh a new bible, if Tindal's tranſlation were called in, vi, 147.

Blackburne, Mr. his motives for the preſent publication, i, ſee Adverti ſement. Archdeacon, his zeal in the cauſe of truth. *ibid.* His belief in Chriſtianity. *ibid.* His hopes of reform in the church. *ibid.* His controverſial works enumerated. *ibid.*

His Epigram. *ibid.* When born, and from whom deſcended, i, Where educated, iii. Admitted penſioner of Catherine-hall, Cambridge. *ibid.* Affected by the death of his brother. *ibid.* His attachment to civil liberty how acquired, iv, and *note.* Afflicted with a nervous diſorder, p. v. His regard to temperance, vi. His knowledge of life how acquired. *ibid.* His Letter to Mr. Turner, v. *note.* Deſcribes his own ambition as a writer, vi. Makes an important diſcovery, vii. Obtains prieſt's orders, *ibid.* Inducted into the rectory of Richmond, viii. His connection with the Archbiſhop of York. *ibid.* Appointed chaplain to the Sheriff, ix. Publiſhes in defence of the rights of the corporation of Richmond, x. His attention to his curate, xi. Correſponds with Mr. Jones the compiler of the Candid Diſquiſitions, xii. His Defence of the Candid Diſquiſitions, xiv. Publiſhes his Diſcourſe on Family Religion. *ibid.* When collated to the Archdeaconry of Cleveland, xv. Congratulated by Dr. Law. *ibid.* Prints a charge, xvi. Anſwers Bp. Butler's charge, xvii. Writes his Addreſs to the Jews, xxi. His Letter to Archbp. Herring, xxii. Differs from Dr. Law in ſome ſentiments, xxiii. Defends Dr. Law. His Anſwer to Dr. Warburton, xxiv. The publication checked, xxv. Anſwers Bp. Clayton and Mr. Penn, xxvi. Attacks Swift's hiſtory of the four laſt years of Queen Anne's reign. *ibid.* The nature of the argument. *ibid. note.* Anſwers Dr. Powell's Sermon on Subſcription, xxvii. His own difficulties with regard to Subſcription, xxviii. Conſults Dr. Law. *ibid.* Refuſes preferment. *ibid.* Undertakes to anſwer Dr. Morton, Mr. Steffe, and Dr. Fleming, xxx. His future acquaintance with Dr. Fleming. *ibid.* Publiſhes his Hiſtorical View, xxxi. His Confeſſional, xxxiii. Warns the clergy againſt the increaſe of papiſts, xxxiv. His Letters to T. Hollis, Eſq. xxxvi, xxxvii, lii. Urged to obtain relief from ſubſcription, xxxix. Draws up his propoſals, &c. xl. Defends Dr. Law againſt Bp. Warburton, xlvi. How "A member of a Law Society," xlvii, and *note.* His attachment to Mr. Lindſey, xlviii. In what points he differs from him, xlix. His Letter to Mr. Rotheram reſpecting Dr. Prieſtley, *ibid.* His opinion of the Quakers. *ibid.* Undertakes to write Mr. Hollis's life, lii. Loſes his ſon, liv. His great grief. *ibid.* His eye-ſight fails, lv, lxiii. Defends Milton againſt Dr. Johnſon, lvii. Charged with a falſe ſtatement by Mr. Berington, lviii. His treatment of Mr. Berington. *ibid.* His high regard for Dr. Diſney, lxi. Never held ſentiments ſimilar to thoſe adopted by Mr. Lindſey, lxii. Aſſiſted by Mr. Tate, lxiii. His averſion to popery, not to pa-

piſts, lxiv. Reſigns the office of commiſſioner. *ibid.* His ſucceſſor a zealous ſtickler for the orthodoxy of canons and rubrics, lxv. His zeal through life. *ibid.* His laſt charge delivered by his eldeſt ſon, lxvi. Farewell addreſs to the clergy, *ibid.* His death, lxvii. His ſurviving children. *ibid. note.* His character, lxviii.—lxxxi. His ſcanty income, lxxiv. Refuſes church preferment. *ibid.* Was invited to join the diſſenters, which he refuſed, lxxv. His attachment to the principles of civil and religious liberty, lxxvi. His characteriſtic opinions as a divine. *ibid.* His opinion on Bp. Butler's ſentiments, lxxxiv. His ſentiments on the ordinance of baptiſm, lxxxvi. Letter to from Dr. Heberden, lxxxix. His letter to Mr. Hollis, xci. His reaſons againſt the opinion that Dr. Johnſon wrote a ſpeech for Dr. Dodd, cxviii. His anſwer to the queſtion, "Why are you not a Socinian," cxx. His reaſons for remaining in the church, I, 198—201. His dedication to the clergy of the Archdeaconry of Cleveland, iv, 1.

Blackburne, Mr. T. the formula propoſed to be ſubſcribed by him at Cambridge, lx.

Blackburne, Archbp. refuſes to permit Dr. Burrows to reſign his living, vi, 19.

Blackſtone, Sir Wm. his opinion of the advantages of the repeal of the teſt-act, vii, 56. The argument which he uſes for diſſenters, vii, 181. *note.*

Bonner, Bp. ſaid to have cauſed ſix bibles to be chained in St. Paul's church, in places convenient for reading, iv, 99, *note.* One of the tranſlators of the bible, vi, 147.

Boſwell, his remarks on the Candid Diſquiſitions, xiii. Of Taunton, his character, 1, 319.

Bower, Mr. the ſincerity of his converſion queſtioned, iv, 32, *note.* Obſervations made on the controverſy which he occaſioned. *ibid.*

Broughton, Mr. his defence of the immaterial and immortal principle in man conſidered, iii, 334. Propoſes to give the adventures of a human ſoul in its progreſs from time to eternity, iii, 345. Contends that the malefactor's ſoul waited ſix weeks before it could be with Chriſt, iii, 346.

Brown, his exhortation to worldly conformity examined, v, 476.

Bull, Bp. controverſy with Trueman, iii, 184.

Burn, Dr. remarks on his opinion concerning the limiting clauſe in the ſtatute 13 Eliz. c. 12, enjoining ſubſcription to the Articles of the church of England, Preface to 2 edit. v, 25, *note.*

Burnet, Bp. his Hiſtory of the reformation quoted and commended, i, 161. His difficulty in wiſhing to get rid of a purgatory, and

to retain an intermediate ſtate, ii, 216. *note.* His opinion of King Edward's Articles, iii, 84. His diſtinction between quieting and ſatisfying the conſcience, iv, 283. *note.* His character of Algernon Sidney, iv, 291. His character of De Marca, as a writer, Preface to 1 edit. v, 102. *note.* Examination of the Introduction to his expoſition of the Thirty-nine articles of the church of England, v, 214. Was the means of releaſing the clergy of Geneva from ſubſcription to their conſenſus doctrinæ, v, 215. Proofs that he undertook his Expoſition with reluctance, v, 216. His ſentiments of this work deduced from his defence of it, v, 222. Entertained hopes of a farther reformation, on the acceſſion of King George I. v. 223. *Note.* Objects to the propriety of the church of England eſtabliſhing theſe articles as a ſtandard of doctrine, v, 225. Inquiry after his alleged apoſtolic formulary of chriſtian doctrines, v, 226. How he accounts for the copious form of doctrine in the church of England, v, 236. His idea of the uſe of the Articles, v, 250. His account of the reaſon for prefixing King James's Declaration to the Articles, v, 263, Objections to his account of the firſt publication of the Articles, v, 269. His Expoſition attacked by the lower houſe of convocation, v, 274. His remark on the twenty-third Article, v, 295. His opinion of the Homilies, v, 303. How replied to by a Lutheran divine, on his recommending an union between Lutherans and Calviniſts, v, 412. His doubts whether the church can make a law to reſtrain the clergy in their natural rights, vii, 215.

Burrow, Dr. deſires to reſign his living, vi, 19. *note.* His character, vi, 20. *note.*

Buſby, Dr. his offer of founding catechiſtical lectures for the religious inſtruction of under-graduates, rejected by both Univerſities, v. 520.

Burton, Dr. his violence reproved, ii, 92. His encomium on Secker's Hebrew literature, ii, 93.

Butler, Bp. in what communion he died, lxxxii, iii.

C

Cabbala Jewiſh, its riſe, iv, 416.

Calamy, Dr. Edmund, his ſentiments on the eighth article of the church of England reſpecting the Athanaſian Creed, v. 317. His teſtimony objected to, vi, 261. *note.* His account of Dr. Sanderſon, vi, 374.

Calvin, when he flouriſhed, iii, 72. His Pſychopannychia. *ibid.* When and where publiſhed. *ibid.*

Calviniſts in Holland, an account of their notions of church government, v, 396.
Camiſards, why ſo called, iv, 183. *note.*
Candid Diſquiſitions, account of the, xi. Violently attacked, xiii.
Canons, 76th. and 75th. quoted, ii, 120.
Canon, obtained at Florence, iii, 52. Remarks on, iii, 53. Of the Lateran council under Leo, 10th, defends a natural immortality of the ſoul, iii, 55.
Capellus, his tract on the intermediate ſtate referred to, iii, 92. *note.*
Carter, Dr. proſecuted for omitting to read the Athanaſian creed, vi, 206.
Cartwright, rejects the authority of the Fathers, in determining religious controverſies, v, 163—4.
Caſaubon, his account of the ſentiments of King James and his biſhops, concerning the edict of the ſtates relating to the Gomariſts and Arminians, v, 391. *note.* Juſtifies the fathers, in introducing Pagan inſtitutions into chriſtian worſhip, v, 464. *note.* Defends the church of England from the charge of ſelf-adulation, vi, 215. His teſtimony objected to as being an intereſted member, *ibid.* Suſpected of being inclined to turn papiſt, *ibid.* Had named a day to make his abjuration, vi, 216. What he meant as a compliment to the church in the days of King James, would now be eſteemed a reproach, vi, 217. Compliments King James for burning an heretic, vi, 223.
Caſtellio, his efforts in expoſing perſecution, iii, 16. An example of great modeſty, iii, 360.
Caſuiſt, an adroit one ſhould be well acquainted with the law of nature, &c. iv, 267. *note.*
Catacombs, a ſtory of i, 203. Where ſaid to be ſituated, i, 217.
Catholics in Britain and Ireland in league with the catholic powers abroad, iv, 227. *note.* Remarks on a late Apology for, iv, 192.
Chandler, Dr. Bradbury, aſſiduous in promoting an epiſcopal eſtabliſhment in America, ii, 58. Calculates the tax on the Americans to ſupport epiſcopacy, ii, 62. His "Appeal," quoted. *ibid. note.*
Chapels, popiſh, celebrated for ſplendid decorations, iv, 9.
Charges of Doctors Rutherforth, Balguy, Tottie, &c. referred to, iv, 264.
Charles I. State of the conteſt between him and the Scots proteſters, on renewing confeſſions of faith ſuited to circumſtances, v, 201. *note.* Was a profound Arminian, and why, v. 264.
Charles II. his intrigues, i, 158. A phraſe uſed by him, i, 34. And James II. were papiſts, iv, 80. His character. *ibid.* His declaration to the Preſbyterians from Breda, Preface to 1 edit.

v, 82. His Declaration relating to the Preſbyterians, vi, 257. Did not venture to annul a marriage which he diſapproved, vii, 214.

Charles VI. A letter to from Pope Clement XI, iv. 148.

Chillingworth, appeal to, i, 314. Quoted, ii, 165. His account of the origin of ſchiſms in the church, v, 188. *note.*

Chriſt, when born, not exactly known, i, 180. His kingdom not capable of alliance with civil communities, on the authority of Bp. Warburton, Preface to 1ſt. edit. " 103.

Chriſtian, miniſter, duty of one conforming to a national religion, iv, 298. Religion is corrupted and cramped by human eſtabliſhments, Adverniſement, v, 14. World, how divided according to Dr. Jortin, i, 133. *note.*

Chriſtianity does not ſupercede the neceſſity of civil government, i, 11. What it is, and where to be learned, iv, 327. Of the 16th. century not like the chriſtianity of the three firſt centuries, iv, 339. *note.* Will not admit of being made the tool of political greatneſs, iv, 340.

Chriſtmas, the manner of keeping, contrary to the purity of religion, i, 186—7.

Chryſoſtom St. quoted, i, 184.

Chubb, Mr. how he died, i, 39.

Church, her claims in the xxth. article, i, 137. Eſtabliſhed, its faults ought not to be gloſſed over, iv. 282. No proteſtant, preſcribes forms of faith, but what is agreeable to the word of God, iv, 410. A definition of, from Mr. Locke, Preface to 2d. edit. v, 33. Archbp. Wake's ſcheme for a union of it with the Gallican church, do. v. 133. Not ſo well diſpoſed to treat of a union with diſſenters, do. v, 135. The zeal of both paſtors and people againſt the church of Rome, viſibly declined, v, 139. The authority of it ſubmitted to the teſt of ſcripture, by Bp. Jewel, v, 211. Why a farther reformation in it, did not take place on the Acceſſion of King George I. v. 223. *note.* The eſtabliſhment of the Articles of it, as a ſtandard of doctrine, objected to by Bp. Burnet, v, 225. The copious form of doctrine in it, how accounted for by Bp. Burnet, v, 236. Why the paſſage in King Edward's Articles againſt the real preſence was ſtruck out, on the review of them in Queen Elizabeth's reign, v, 244. The uſe of the thirty-nine Articles, according to Bp. Burnet, v, 250. The articles of it ſolemnly accepted by a reſolution of the houſe of Commons, in the reign of King Charles I. v, 264. In what ſenſe it has been always unanimous in points of doctrine, v, 277. Inquiry whether the reaſonableneſs of con-

formity to it, is consistent with the rights of private judgment, v, 332. The mode of subscription required to the Articles of it, v, 353. The clergy of it, charged with departing in practice from their articles, v, 355. *note.* Subscription to the Articles of it, a total resignation of the right of private judgment, v, 356. The first occasion of difference between it and the puritans, v, 376. Archbp. Parker's exposition of the regal supremacy over it, v, 381. Is agitated by the contests between the Arminians and the Puritan defenders of the doctrinal articles, v, 398. Arminianism prevalent at present among the subscribers, v, 413. A reformation in it, necessary, v, 449. By whom a reformation of it should be undertaken, v, 450. The first clause of the twentieth Article, of suspicious authority, v, 460. *note.* Examination of the alleged unfitness of the present times for attempting a farther reformation, v, 467. Expediency of a review of the forms of it relating to the Trinity, v, 489. Proper test of the doctrines of it, by which a reform should be conducted, v, 506. See ARTICLES, LITURGY, and ORDINATION. No difficulty of supplying it with candidates, vi, 10. *note.* Champions for the, vii, 69. Establishment, its legality considered, i, 163—4. Of England, Dr. Mosheim's character of, Preface to 1st. edit. v, 74. How this character might be made good, do. v, 75. Review of the steps taken for the farther reformation of, do. v, 76. Remarks on the Hampton-court conference, do. v, 78. The Savoy conference, do. v, 81. A reform in it, how defeated in the reign of William III. do. v. 88. Observations on the conduct of, in professing a disposition toward reformation, do. v, 93. The civil power not averse to a reformation in it, do. v, 96. Defended from the charge of self-adulation by Grotius and the two Casaubons, vi, 214. Testimony respecting of foreign protestants, vi, 231 and *note.* Ireland, forced to conform to all the English rites and ceremonies, vi, 230. Power, the foundations and by whom rooted out, vi, 193. *note.*

Cicero, examination of his religious opinions, v, 367. *note.* His observations on superstition, v, 368. *note.* His principles of legislation, v, 369. *note.* Le Clerc's character of him, v, 495. Bp. Warburton's apology for him. *ib. note.*

Civil Magistrate, his great use in affairs of religion, according to Dr. Jortin, v, 325. According to Archbp. Tillotson, v, 370. *note.*

Clarendon, Lord, his tract of the reverence due to antiquity, iv, 346. *note.* His conduct in the Savoy conference. Preface to 1st. edit. v, 81.

Clarke Dr. the admiration of all Europe, i, 369. And Hoadly wiſh for reformation, but wanted ſpirit to purſue it, i, 370. His conduct accounted for, i, 371. His diſpoſition to diſcuſs the doctrine of the Trinity candidly, i, 372. His opinion that a creature might be co-eternal with its creator, i, 375. His opinion of the ſoul, iii, 62. Reaſon for not noticing, iii, 339. His defence of the ſcripture as the only authority in religion, v, 334. Deduction from his arguments, v, 343. Suppoſed a ſubſcription agreeable to the office of ordination, ſufficient without ſubſcription to the thirty-nine Articles, v. 512. *note.* The offer made to him, vi, 194. *note.* Memoirs of by Whiſton referred to, vi, 194.

Clayton Bp. his Eſſay on ſpirit quoted, i, 165. His plea for latitude in ſubſcription to the Articles of the church of England, examined, v, 357. His notion of the dependence of civil ſociety on doctrinal points in religion, inquired into, v, 360. Admits the advantages of religious freedom, v, 364. Was in danger for oppoſing the Athanaſian Creed, v, 487. His diſpoſition toward a farther religious reform, v, 492. Fell a ſacrifice to his free ſentiments concerning this creed, vi, 207. *note.*

Clemens Alexandrinus account of his life quoted and referred to, iv, 280. *note.*

Clement XI, Pope, his letter to the King of Spain, iv, 68. *note.* A letter from Charles VI. Emperor of Germany. *ibid.* 148.

Clerc Le, his criterion for critics, iii, 24. *note.*

Clergy, immoral how treated, i, 32. 1800 of them deprived of their livings by the act of Uniformity, i, 159. Some of the, petition parliament for relief from ſubſcription, iv, 375. Others thought it decent firſt to apply to their eccleſiaſtical ſuperiors. *ibid.* The duty of, to ſtudy the ſcriptures, iv, 407. Proteſtant, muſt appeal to the ſcriptures, iv, 409. Should have the preparation of the heart to underſtand the ſcriptures, iv, 428. Profligacy, the characteriſtic of very few, iv, 429. Should not conform to the world, iv, 430. A large majority, think no alterations neceſſary in the conſtitution, vi, 11. Thoſe who think differently have no bond of union. *ibid.* Many of them have been reminded of the 73d. canon, vi, 12. Few of the thinking part of them agree exactly in ſentiment with their former opinions, vi, 15. Many aſſent to the *uſe*, not the *truth* of the liturgy, vi, 16. Some juſtify their conformity in hopes of alteration in the liturgy, vi, 17. Some think that the obligation to the Lord of the harveſt, is prior to all ſtipulations with any particular church, vi, 18. Beneficed, alledge that they are not *ſtipendiaries*, but *proprietors*, vii, 216.

Orthodox, differ very widely in their opinions, vii, 134. Should underſtand the languages in which the ſcriptures were written, iv, 420. Many of them will not bear the teſt of examination, iv. 421, Follow the common track. *ibid.* Should have a competent knowledge of the manners and cuſtoms of the jewiſh and heathen world, iv, 422. Should pay attention to the whole of God's diſpenſations, iv, 420.

Clergyman, his courſe of life directed by canons 75 and 76, ii, 120—1. His duty, iv, 267.

Clergymen, a ſketch of the contradictions and inconſiſtencies laid upon, circulated by order of the committee of aſſociated clergy, vii, 23.

Coke, his detection quoted, i, 160.

Colbatch, Dr. remarks on his inquiry into the antiquity and authority of the Apoſtles Creed, v, 232. *note.*

Comber, Dr. his converſation with Mr. Blackburne, p. xlv. Conſequences of, *ibid.*

Comedies, repreſenting the leading ſcenes in Chriſt's life, not diſapproved by Eraſmus, i, 75. Condemned by Archdeacon Blackburne. *ib.*

Common-Prayer, the ſincerity of thoſe who reviſed it at the reſtoration, iv, 317. *note.* Defamed, vi, 247.

Commons houſe of, debate in reſpecting the petition of the clergy, p. xli. Appoint a committee to examine Mr. White's book of Purgatory and Hobbes's Leviathan, iii, 176. Petition to the, for relief in matters of religion, iv, 375. Its ſolemn avowal of the thirty-nine articles of the church of England, in the reign of King Charles I. v, 264.

Comprehenſion, See CHURCH OF ENGLAND, PURITANS, HAMPTON-COURT, SAVOY, TILLOTSON, &c.

Concord book, of the intolerant ſpirit of, v, 155. *note.*

Confeſſion, the firſt Helvetic, iii, 79. Confeſſions harmony of, publiſhed at Geneva, iii, 79. *note.* Exhibited to the council of Trent, iii, 80. Second Helvetic, calviniſtical, iii, 85. Probably drawn up by Beza, iii, 86. What the ſeventh article. *ibid.* Scottiſh, declares againſt the ſleep of the ſoul, iii, 88. Ratified at Edinburgh, *ibid.*

Confeſſional, how and when publiſhed, p. xxxiii. Highly eſteemed by Dr. Law, p. xxxiv. Andrew Millar's objection to the term, p. lxxxix. Tranſlated into the Dutch, p. xc. Propoſed to be tranſlated into the French language. *ibid.* Printed in Ireland, p. xciii. Occaſional remarks upon ſome late ſtrictures on the, vi, 163. The loudeſt clamour againſt, on account of high treaſon againſt Archbp. Wake, vi, 359.

Confeſſions of faith, the natural conſequences of impoſing them on the clergy, Preface to 1ſt. edit. 142. The origin of them among the firſt reformers, v, 150. The diſtractions occaſioned by them, v, 160. The right of eſtabliſhing them inquired into, v, 170. A rigorous inforcement of them would probably exclude diligent ſearchers of the ſcriptures from every communion where ſuch power is exerciſed, v, 174. Inquiry into the conſequences of non-ſubſcription, after being educated to the miniſtry, v, 184. *note.* The required ſubſcription to them not to be aſſerted without interfering with the right of private judgment, v, 186. Examination of the Apology of the Remonſtrants in Holland, v, 195. The Apoſtolic foundation of them inquired into, v, 226.

Conformity uſeful to peace, vii, 327, 341.

Confuſion, for what it ſtood, vii, 72.

Conjecturers, the Engliſh, a nation of, vii, 64.

Conſcience, to be kept for God, if the hand be given to public peace, vii, 330, 344.

Conſtance, the council of, admits the decretals as of equal authority with the epiſtles of the apoſtles, v, 242. *note.*

Controverſy, theological, its uſe and importance, iii, 7. Reſpecting Geneva diſcipline, iii, 16. Between Jurieu and Saurin, iii, 207. One of the prime arts of, is miſrepreſentation, vi, 188.

Controverſies, their uſe in religion. Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 121.

Conſtitution civil, its excellence, i, 24. Eccleſiaſtical definition of a deſirable one, Advertiſement, v, 17.

Convents, in France, an account of, iv, 163.

Conviction, the ſmall ſhare it has in influencing the conduct of mankind, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 118.

Convocation, a reformation of the church of England how obſtructed by it in the reign of William III. Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 88. The lower houſe of, attacks Bp. Burnet's Expoſition of the thirty-nine Articles, v, 274.

Conybeare, Bp. remarks on his Sermon, intituled, the Caſe of Subſcription, Preface to 2d. edit. v, 27. *note.* v, 172. *note.*

Corpus Confeſſionum, the intention of that work, v, 156. Remarks on the Synopſis in it, v, 158.

Council, Lateran, Luther's opinion of, iii, 55. *note.*

Coward, Dr. William, his thoughts concerning the human ſoul, iii, 216. Conſidered as an enemy to chriſtianity, iii, 217. Proves that his opinions were not hereſies, iii, 218. Charged of being fond of myſtery, iii, 221. Was a very learned man, iii, *ibid.* Toland and Collins execrated by numbers, who never read or underſtood them, iii, 265.

Cranmer, Archbp. negociates with Melancthon for a common confeſſion of faith to unite proteſtant churches, v, 269. Was concerned in compoſing King Edward's Articles, v, 271. Was the principal compiler of them, v, 285. No more infallible than Pope Leo X, vii, 5. His ſyſtem altered by Parker. *ibid.* Admits that general councils may err. *ibid.* The ſenſe in which he and Ridley wiſhed the articles to be ſubſcribed, vii, 227. *note.*

Creed, Apoſtles, remarks on Dr. Colbatch's manuſcript treatiſe of it, v, 232. *note.* For that of St. Athanaſius, ſee ATHANASIAN.

D

D'Alembert, inquiry into the juſtneſs of the ſuperiority he attributes to the proteſtant univerſities in Germany, over thoſe of the Romiſh perſuaſion. Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 125. *note.* His account of the motives which led to the expulſion of the Jeſuits, do. v, 127. *note.*

Dalrymple, Mr. extract from his Sermon before the Synod of Glaſgow, in favour of chriſtian liberty, v, 529. *note.*

Damvilliers, his reflections on the ſubſcription required in France to the condemnation of Janſenius, Advertiſement, v, 11.

Daniel, prophet, a paſſage from, predicting the revival of learning in the 15th. century, iv, 370.

Davenant, Bp. is reprimanded in council for preaching on predeſtination, v, 409. Aſſerts predeſtination to be the doctrine of the church of England, v, 428.

Davenport, ſee SINCLAIR.

Dawſon, Dr. his remarks on Mr. Steffe, iii, 263. *note.* His character as a defender of religious liberty, Advertiſement, v, 4.

Declaration, of King James I. prefixed to the thirty-nine Articles of the church of England, the hiſtory of it inquired into, v, 257.

Decretals, are admitted by the council of Conſtance, as of equal authority with the epiſtles of the Apoſtles, v, 242. *note.*

De Foe, his ſatire entituled, The true born Engliſhman, obſervations on it, iv, 40. *note.*

De Marca, his character as a writer, by Bp. Burnet, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 102. *note.*

Democritus, an atomical atheiſt, iii, 138.

Des Cartes, his ſyſtem, iii, 117. Maintains that all thinking ſubſtances were diſtinct from matter, iii, 118.

De Trautſohn, John Joſeph, Archbp. of Vienna, obſervations on his paſtoral letter, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 124. *note.*

" *Devotion*, to the ſacred heart of Jeſus," an account of a book ſo intituled, iv, 114.

Dialogues, moral and political, quoted, iii, 7. *note.*
Diſcipline, church, an expreſſion of looſe ſignification, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 109. *note.*
Diſney, Dr. his memoirs of Jebb referred to, p. cxvi. Highly eſteemed by Mr. Blackburne, p. lxi. His ſeparation from the church. *ibid.* Not to be imputed to Mr. Blackburne, lxii.
Diſquiſitions, free and candid, what part Mr. Blackburne had in, i, 315. By whom compiled. *ibid.* Editor and compiler of, his views very honourable, i, 316. Apology for the authors of, ii, 135.
Diſſenters, favoured by King William and by George I, and II, ii, 81—2. Object to kneeling at the Lord's ſupper, vi, 50. Not free from the common paſſions of mankind, vi, 225. Their printed caſe, vii, 179. Their argument for relief, vii, 181. *note.* Some of them diſparage their principles, vii, 182. *note.* A regard to, by not impoſing unneceſſary articles, vii, 332, 345.
Diſſidents, Poliſh, their hiſtory publiſhed at a ſeaſonable opportunity, iv, 246.
Divine Legation, ſome paſſages in the laſt edition of reviewed, ii, 339.
Divines, modern, not more intelligible than the old ſchoolmen, iii, 57.
Doctrine, diſcipline and worſhip in the church, ſome things exceptionable, i, p. 196. Difference between a general and particular, ii, 295, and *note.*
Doctrines, chriſtian, examination whether any fixed formulary of them is to be juſtified from the writings of St. Paul, v, 226. Inquiry after this formulary itſelf, v, 228.
Dodd, Dr. his ſpeech before condemnation ſuppoſed to be made for him by Dr. Johnſon, p. cxviii.
Doddridge, Dr. proſecuted for keeping an academy, i, 325. His victory over the chancellor. *ibid.*
Dodwell, reaſon for not noticing, iii, 340. His hypotheſis explained, iii, 342.
Dominis, Anthony, writes concerning the ſeparate exiſtence of the ſoul, iii, 97. His character by Fuller. *ibid.*
Dublin, a letter from, iv, 183, 186. Sir Edward Newnham's charge to the Grand Jury, iv, 187.
Du Pin, M. L'Avocate's apology for his negociating with Archbp. Wake, for a union between the Engliſh and Gallican churches, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 134. *note.* Dr. his character by Wake, vi, 366. *note.*
Durell, Dr. David, his miſrepreſentation of the petitioners, vii, 80.
Durham, Bp. of, an anſwer to his charge, i, 91.

E

Education, religious, fatal consequences of the neglect of, iv, 418.
Edward VI. his plan of perfecting the English reformation, i, 278. His 40th. Article condemns the doctrine of the sleep of the soul, iii, 83.
Eleazar, and his brethren, account of their sufferings, ii, 395. Their last words, ii, 396.
Elizabeth, Queen, a deviation from the spirit of the first reformers in her reign, iv, 23. *note*. Knew how to speak to her parliaments, iv, 25. Excommunicated by Sixtus V, iv, 77. *note*. Indications of her having temporized with the papists, in conducting the reformation, v, 244. Foundation of orthodoxy during her reign, v, 249. Osborne's account of her assuming the supremacy, v, 260. Connives at the bishops oppressing the puritans, v, 376. Was offered the sovereignty of six of the seven united provinces, v, 396. Her anger with the Earl of Leicester, on account of his marriage, vii, 214.
Emperor, how far sovereign of Germany, iv, 386. *note*.
Encyclopedie, a remark on the religious freedoms in that work, being wrote by professed catholics, Preface to 1st. edit. v, 120. *note*.
Engagement, Dr. Sanderson's ingenious salvoes for taking it, after opposing the Covenant, v, 436. Is subscribed by Dr. Barrow, who afterward prevails to have his name struck out, v, 444. *note*.
English, their character, vii, 64. Traveller's letter, how procured, p. xciv.
Enoch, in what circumstances by his translation, ii, 297. The account of, considered, ii, 300.
Elijah, his translation more conspicuous than that of Enoch, ii, 299.
Episcopius, defends himself and brethren, iii, 91. His controversy in defence of the confession of faith, published by the Remonstrants in Holland, v, 206—7.
Epitaph, a curious one on death, iii, 167.
Erasmus, the object of printing his Preface to the paraphrase of Matthew's gospel, &c. i, 27. His epistles quoted, iii, 19. *note*. His conduct with regard to the reformation, iii, 26. *note*. Shews the absurdity and iniquity of protestants punishing Anabaptists, iv, 65. *note*. On some questions very averse from discussion, iii, 45. *note*. Supposed by some to die a Lutheran, i, 50. Curious letter to, from Pope Leo, X, i, 54. His preface to his paraphrase on St. Matthew's gospel, i, 56. *Desiderius*, his account of the precedence given by catholics to the papal rescripts, above the epistles of St. Peter and St. Paul, v, 242. *note*. His remarks on the corruptions of the Romish church, v, 497. *note*.

Erasmus Johannes, rejects the authority of fathers and councils in religious doctrines, and is forced to fly his country for it, v, 164.
Establishments, ecclesiastical, Bp. Hoadly's opinion concerning, i, 289. Religious truth not to be preserved under them, unless counteracted by the exercise of religious freedom, v, 364. The meaning of the terms inquired into, v, 365. See CONFESSIONS OF FAITH, ARTICLES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, PROTESTANTS, &c.
Eugenius, IV, Pope, brings his council from Ferrara, to Florence, iii, p. 52. Defrays the expence of the Emperor and Grecian bishops journey into Italy, iii, 52, *note*. Sold his plate and pawned his tiara, iii, 52. *note*.
Evangelics, the original name of protestants, iv, 366.
Expedience, no sufficient foundation for a discretionary exercise of church authority, v, 179.
External Religion, the importance of, i, 97.

F

Faith, christian, committed to the defence of King Charles. vi, 232. Public, the necessity of, vii, 329, 343.
Fathers, the consequences of their introducing pagan institutions into christian worship, v, 465. *note*. Their disingenuity instanced, v, 494.
Feathers, tavern, meeting of the clergy at the, xli.
Fire, great, of London, how many houses destroyed in, ii, 174.
Fleetwood, Bp. his letter to an inhabitant of St. Andrews, Holborn, referred to and commended, i, p. 146.
Fleming, Dr. Caleb, the first who maintained that the resurrection takes place immediately after death, iii, 348.
Forms in religion, not necessary for the purposes of piety, i, 147. Hackneyed, what meant thereby, vi, 212.
Foster, Dr. attempts made to persecute, i, 312. His disinterested opposition to subscriptions, v, 184. *note*.
Fothergil, Dr. undertakes to prove the articles of the church of England not to be calvinistical, v, 384. *note*.
Fox, the martyrologist, his reflection on the university of Oxford, v, 536.
France civil wars in, iv, 14.
Free and Candid Disquisitions, the probable effects of that publication, Preface to 1st. edit. v, 68.

Fuller, Dr. examination of his ſuppoſed latitude of general terms employed in the articles of the church of England, v, 345. His account of the origin of the term puritan, v, 399.
Furneaux, Dr. a letter to, on the confeſſional, xc. His account of the articles, vi, 79.

G

Gallio, his perſonal virtues, iv, 324.
Gaſſendi, oppoſes the doctrine of Des Cartes, iii, 119. His doctrine oppoſed by Mr. Arnauld. *ibid.*
Geneva, controverſy about its diſcipline, iii, 16. The clergy of, releaſed from ſubſcription to their Conſenſus doctrinæ, by the means of Bp. Burnet, v, 215.
Gentleman, an engliſh, a letter from his friend in London, iv, 162.
George I. and II. both friendly to the diſſenters, ii, 81.
Germany, the proteſtant and popiſh univerſities of, compared, v, 123. *note.*
Girard, John Baptiſt, convicted of ſpiritual inceſt, iv, 119. *note.*
God, eſſence of, neither generates nor is generated, iii, 64. *note.* The wiſdom of, comprized the jewiſh ſyſtem, iv, 299.
Goddard Dr. his character, xxiv. His ſermon on an intermediate ſtate, iii, 244. Anſwered by Mr. Peckard, *ibid.* And by an anonymous writer, iii, 245.
Goſpel, never intended to exclude the exerciſe of poſitive human laws, i. 15.
Goſpellers, the original name of proteſtants, iv, 366.
Government, civil, the bad effects which popiſh principles have upon it, iv, 21. The ſubſiſtence of it not dependent on doctrinal forms of religion, v, 361. The true uſe of religion to it, v, 363. The advantages of religious toleration to it, v, *ib.* The object of, to ſee that no new religions are introduced, vii, 324, 335. Eccleſiaſtical, its tendency, vii, 66.
Governors, ſubmiſſion to, a chriſtian duty, iv, 338.
Great Names, deference to, injurious to the intereſts of truth and liberty, vi, 344. *note.*
Grenada, a warning of the encouragement now given to catholics in that iſland, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 132.
Grindal, Archbp. Strype's life of, quoted, iv, 24. *note.*
Grotius, his opinion of the ſpirit, ii, 329. *note.* The advocate for the ſeparate exiſtence of the ſoul, ii, 389. His opinion of the Sadducees, ii, 400. *note.* His criticiſm on Peter, 1ſt. epiſt. ii, 9, iv, 301. *note.* His explanation of the grammatical ſenſe

of doctrinal propoſitions, v, 288. Forms a ſcheme for an union between proteſtants and catholics, v, 389. Joinly with Barnevelt, draws up the edict of the ſtates reſpecting the Gomariſts and Arminians, v, 390. Defends the church of England from the charge of ſelf-adulation, vi, 214, 219. His wife's teſtimony. *ibid.* Le Clerc's teſtimony reſpecting him, *ibid.*

Grove, Mr. began a work on a future ſtate, iii, 47.

H

Hades, Dr. Warburton's opinion of its meaning, ii, 289. *note.*

Hales, Mr. of Eton, remarks on his letter to Archbp. Laud, v, 460. Furniſhes evidence of the ſuſpicious authority of the firſt clauſe of the twentieth article of the church of England, v, *ib. note.* His golden remains quoted, iv, 415.

Hallet, ſhews the impoſſibility of proving a future ſtate by the light of nature, iii, 231. Anſwered by Mr. Grove, iii, 234. Defended in a pamphlet, intituled, the Materiality or Soul of Man, iii, 241.

Hallifax, Dr. his conduct to Mr. Blackburne, lxxxii.

Hampton-court conference, remarks on it, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 78, 383.

Harmony of the confeſſions, publiſhed by the Belgic and Gallican churches, v, 154. Objections againſt this work, v, 155.

Harris, Dr. ſtrictures on his account of King James's conteſt with Vorſtius, v, 387. *note.*

Hartley, Dr. David, remarks on his character of the chriſtian church, in his obſervations on man, v, 494, 502. His objections to ſubſcribing to the divine authority of the ſcriptures, v, 513.

Heavens, how many, reckoned by the jews, ii, 189.

Heberden, Dr. his remarks on ſubſcription, lxxxix.

Hell, the various ſenſes in which it is uſed in the 3d. article, vi, 79. Often ſignified purgatory, vi, 147. After the reformation, for many years, was taken for the place of final puniſhment, vi, 148.

Hereſy, the origin of, among the firſt reformers, v, 148—9. Is perpetuated and multiplied by church cenſures, v, 202. Arabian, the patrons of a ſeparate exiſtence made a figure in, iii, 99. *note.*

Heretic, one burnt by King James, vi, 223.

Herring, Archbp. his character, ii, 125. Letter to, ii, 101.

Heylin, Peter, an interpolation in King James's declaration prefixed to the articles of the church of England, detected; as it appears in his Bibliotheca Regia, v, 259. *note.* His character,

v, 165. Aſſerts the authority of the Homilies, v, 306. Afterwards abides by the ſecond book only, v, 307. His teſtimony in favour of the authenticity of the firſt clauſe of the twentieth article of the church of England, unſatisfactory, v. 461 *note*. Denies that there is any liberty left in the articles for diſſenting judgments, vi, 85. Dr. his opinion of the firſt Engliſh reformers who compiled the church articles, v, 423. *note*.

Hoadly, Bp. his opinion of eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhments, i, 289. His ſentiments on church government, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 103. His opinion of the Homilies of the church of England, v, 308. Propoſes a temporiſing plan of reformation, v, 466. Alleges an unfitneſs in the preſent times for undertaking a reformation, v, 467. Conſidered the *occaſional* and *ſchiſm* acts, as perſecuting laws, vi, 340. Attacked the corporation and teſt acts, *ibid.* His ſermon on the nature of the kingdom of Chriſt provoked Archbp. Wake, vi, 341. Would probably have been perſecuted if the times would have admitted of it, *ibid.* With him the *church demoliſhers* did not expire, vi, 346.

Hobbs, his Leviathan noticed by the houſe of Commons, iii, 176.

Holidays, the abrogation of all, iv, 108. *note*.

Holland, Dr. his uſual benediction, iv, 259.

Hollis, Thos. Eſq. dies and leaves Mr. Blackburne 500l. li. His Memoirs publiſhed, lvi. Quoted, cxviii.

Homilies, Archbp. Laud's conditional ſubſcription to them, v, 304. Bp. Burnet's declared opinion of them, v, 305. Sinclair's account of them, v, *ib.* Bp. Barlow's account of them, 306. The ſentiments of Peter Heylin concerning them, v, *ib.* Bp. Hoadly's opinion of them, v, 307. To be read on certain days, vi, 212. *note*.

Howe, John, a defender of the immortality of the ſoul, iii, 368.

Hudibras's caſuiſtry on an oath, vi, 192. *note*.

Hugonots, their character. iv, 17.

Hume, Mr. his account of the age of Thomas Becket, iii, 12.

Huſſites, their reſolution, iv, 308. *note*.

Hutchins, a lecture founded by him in defence of the liturgy, vi, 201.

Hutton, Archbp. his character deſcribed, i, 16.

Hypocriſy, deſtructive to true religion, v, 364.

I

Ibbetſon, Dr. his zeal, vii, 69. *note*.

Ignorant, how they are to be inſtructed, iv, 420.

Illyricus, *Flacius*, his juſtification, iv, 310. *note*.

Immortality, natural, ſubverſive of the chriſtian doctrine, iii, 214.
Incumbent, non-reſident, nonſenſe in terms, ii, 122.
Innocent man, in what caſes he may ſuffer, i, 21.
Intermediate ſtate. what called, by Dr. Warburton, ii, 292.
Ireland, teſtimonies relating to the ſtate of popery there, iv, 180. The articles of religion there, repealed by the convocation, and thoſe of the church of England ſubſtituted, v, 359. *note*.

J

James I. his threat to the Puritans, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 77. His former ſentiments, and how altered, do. *ibid*. Account of his Declaration prefixed to the articles of the church of England, v, 257. How induced to favour the Arminians, v, 263. Was diſſatisfied with Archbp. Parker's limitation of the regal ſupremacy over the church, v, 382. His conduct at the Hampton-court conference, v, 385. Attempts to confute Vorſtius's book De Deo, v, 387. Favours Grotius's ſcheme for a coalition between the proteſtants and catholics, v, 390. His inſtructions to the ſix divines ſent by him to the Synod of Dort, v, 395. Account of his religious and political opinions, v, 396. His objections to religious toleration, v, 398. Enjoins all undignified clergymen to forbear preaching on certain doctrinal points, v, 400. Anecdote of him, and the biſhops Andrews and Neale, v, 507—9 *note*. Zealous for the divine right of epiſcopal juriſdiction, vi, 314, *note*. Admits the ſupremacy of the pope as patriarch of the Weſt, *ibid*.
James, II. King, his addreſs to the proteſtant princes, iv, 26. *note*. His character, iv, 81.
James St. his definition of chriſtianity, iv, 298.
Janſeniſts, their tenets prejudicial to the intereſts of the church of Rome, v, 129. *note*.
Janſenius, remarks on his ſyſtem of grace, v, 425. His book condemned, v, 426. His doctrines ſuppreſſed in France, as tending to a proteſtant reformation, v, 427.
Jenyns, Mr. his character of popery, Advertiſement, v, 5.
Jerome, Francis, De, ſaid to have performed miracles after his death, iv, 118. *note*.
Jerom, St. a character of, v, 494.
Jeſuits, their character, iv, 18. *note*. The motives that operated to their expulſion, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 127. *note*. Probability of their reſtoration, do. v, *ib*. *note*.
Jewel, Bp. ſubmits all church authority to the teſt of ſcripture,

v, 211. Character of his Apology for the church of England, v, 239.

Jews, a ſtory of two, i, 203. Candid addreſs to, 237. Bill to naturalize them repealed, reaſons given for, i, 250. Ill uſage of, thought by ſome, well pleaſing to God, i, 252. Chriſtian prejudices againſt, i, 252—5. Ought to be re-conſidered, i, 255. Hiſtorical treatiſe of quoted, i, 268. And chriſtians, in what they agree, i, 241. In what they differ, i, 242. What they thought of the ſoul, ii, 272. The ſentiments of individuals not readily known, iv, 326.

Johnſon, Mr. of Cranbrook, his cenſure of Dr. Calamy's remark on the eighth article of the church of England, reſpecting the Athanaſian creed, v, 317.

Jones, *Rev. John*, compiler of the Candid Diſquiſitions, xi. Mr. a card to him, v, 536.

Jortin, Dr. his remark, xxxvi. *note*. His opinion of the act of toleration, i, 310. His diſſertation referred to, ii, 324. *note*. His ſermon on the ſoul's immortality conſidered, iii, 307. His acknowledgment of the great uſe of the civil magiſtrate in religious concerns, v, 325. His criticiſm on the word hell, vi, 147. *note*.

Johnſon, Dr. ſuppoſed to have written a ſpeech for Dr. Dodd, cxviii.

Joſephus, the author of an account of the martyrdom of Eleazar and his brethren, ii, 393.

Junius, his opinion of the limits of the power of the legiſlature, vii, 217. *note*.

K

Keene, Dr. wiſhes Mr. B. to diſavow the Confeſſional, if not the author, xxxiii.

Kennet, Bp. his definition of the church of England, i, 163.

Kings of England, ancient, at their inauguration ſwore to maintain their religion, vii, 325. 336.

King of England, becomes a ſpiritual perſon, vii, 194, and *note*. According to Parker he might reſerve the prieſthood for himſelf, vii, 195. *note*. If he diſcharged the function of the prieſthood, he might aſſume the revenue, *ibid. note*.

L

La Roche, charges Arminianiſm on the church of England, v, 413. *note.*

Lardner, Dr. his reflections on the council of Nice, offenſive to Archbp. Secker, Adverti ſement, v, 8. His remark on alterations of religion, v, 328. *note.*

Laud, Archbp. his title to Pſalms, 59, 67, ii, 28. Endeavoured to ſilence theological diſputes, iii, 23, 22. *note.* The Appendix to his conſideration on the theories of religion, iii, 243. Admits the limitation of ſubſcription to the articles of the church of England in the ſtatute, 13 Eliz. c. 12. Preface to 2d. edit. v, 26. *note.* His conduct toward the Puritans, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 78. His conditional ſubſcription to the Homilies, v, 304. Procures an injunction, forbidding undignified clergymen preaching on certain doctrinal points, v, 400. The reaſon of his patronizing Mr. Montague, v, 401. Gets the prohibition of preaching on controverted points extended to Deans and Biſhops, v, 409. Impoſed an Arminian ſenſe on the church articles, v, 427. Remarks on Mr. Hales's letter to him, v, 460. A character of him, vi, 251. His ſeverity drove a number of gentlemen to ſettle in Maſſachuſetts, vi, 251. Another character, vi, 252, and *note.* His ſpeech before the Lords, vi, 253. *note.*

Launoi, John de, attempts to reduce the calendar of popiſh ſaints, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 60—1.

Law, Dr. his character and friendſhip for Mr. Blackburne, xxiii, and *note.* His Conſiderations on the theory of religion, character of, *ibid.* Correſpondence between, and Dr. Warburton, cviii. Extracts of letters to Mr. Blackburne, cxvi. Dr. his character, xxiii. His conſiderations referred to, ii, 208, 182.

Laws eccleſiaſtical, when they ceaſe to bind, vii, 332, 345. Human, ſhould be adminiſtered upon religious principle, i, 15. Penal, made againſt popery, have been thought ſevere, iv, 29. Reaſons why they ſhould not be repealed, *ibid.*

Latimer, his opinion of the eſtabliſhed religion, i, 305.

Latitude, in ſubſcription to the articles, allowable according to Bp. Hurd, vii, 321. According to Bp. Taylor it is the worſt remedy, and hath ſomething in it of craft, *ibid.*

Lavington, Bp. quoted, ii, 46.

Layton, Henry, Eſq. a ſhort account of, iii, 325. Not profeſſedly Dr. Coward's advocate, iii, 126.

Lazarus, and the rich man, remarks on the parable of, ii, 418. Parable of, and the rich man conſidered, iii, 133. *note.*

Leander, his account of the ſeveral fundamentals in which the church of England agree with the church of Rome, iv, 231. *note.*
Learning, what it owes to the preſs, iii, 21. *note.*
Le Clerc, his opinion of the Sadducees, ii, 402. His character of St. Jerom, v, 494.
Legiſlation, an examination of Cicero's principles of it, v, 369. *note.*
Legiſlature, how limited, vii, 217. *note.*
Leighton, Bp. his opinion of the government and diſcipline of the church of England, i, 346.
Leſlie, remarks on his intended accommodation between the church of England, and that of France, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 137. *note.*
L'Eſtrange, Sir Roger, his opinion of the extent of ſubſcription required to the articles of the church of England, by the ſtatute, 13 Eliz. c. 12. Preface to 2d. edit. v, 28. *note.*
Leyburn, his attack upon Mr. White's book, iii, 172.
Liberty, religious, evidences that a warm love of it is ſtill exiſting, Preface to 2d. edit. v, 19. Encroachments on it, not to be defended on proteſtant principles, do. v, 20. Its friends, how kept under in Queen Anne's reign, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 99. The advantages of it admitted by Bp. Clayton, v, 364. Better underſtood now than formerly, iv, 59. George II. favourable to, ii, 127.
Lindſey, Rev. Theophilus, his character and reſignation, xlvii. Opens a chapel in London, xlviii. His agreement with Dr. Prieſtley, *ibid.* His opponents, *ibid.* To whom married, *ibid. note.* His motives for quitting the church very honourable, iv, 270.
Litchfield and Coventry, biſhop of, Dedication to, vii, 275.
Liturgy, reaſons for not reading on old Chriſtmas day, i, 176. Expediency of a review of the forms in it, relating to the Trinity, v, 490. See ARTICLES, CHURCH OF ENGLAND, and ORDINATION.
Locke, Mr. his opinion of the ſoul's immateriality, ii, 405. *note.* His Controverſy on, with Bp. Stillingfleet, iii, 211. His reaſonableneſs of chriſtianity commended, iii, 215. His definition of a church, Preface to 2d. edit. v, 33. His idea of church government, do. v, 43. The tendency of his letters on Toleration, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 99. His reaſonableneſs of chriſtianity defended, vii, 14. *note.*
London Evening Poſt, a ſtanza from the, ii, 173.
Lord's-day, how it ought to be kept, 186.
Lord's-ſupper, diſſenters object to kneeling at, vi, 50.

Lowth, his viſitation ſermon commended, iv, 370.
Louvain univerſity, there belongs to the Engliſh and Iriſh, iv, 167.
Luther Martin, laid bare the ſuperſtition of the times, iii, 15. A Connoiſſeur in muſic, iii, 19. One of his domeſtic concerts the ſubject of a picture by Titian. *ibid.* An ingenious deſigner, *ibid.* Sacrifices to the muſes during the rage of controverſy. *ibid.* Profited by the conduct of Eraſmus, iii, 27. *note.* His defence of the propoſitions condemned by Leo, X. His opinion of the power of the church, iii, 63. Ranks the natural immortality of the ſoul amongſt the monſtrous opinions of popery, iii, 63. Eſpouſes the ſleep of the ſoul on ſcripture principles, iii, 64. His Commentary on Eccleſiaſtes, iii, 65. An enquiry into his ſentiments concerning the ſtate of the ſoul, between death and the reſurrection, iii, 379. According to Perron, believed that the ſoul died with the body, and that God would hereafter raiſe both; this was denied by Bayle, *ibid.* His behaviour on the day of his death, iii, 393. Had never ſeen a bible till in his 23d. year, A. D. 1506, iv, 367. Examines the allegorical interpretation of ſcripture, iv, 413. Expoſes the errors of the church of Rome, *ibid.* Excuſeable for deviating from his own plan, iv, 414. *note.* And Calvin, wiſhed to bring chriſtianity back to its primitive ſtate, iv, 339. At the beginning of his reformation, left it free for chriſtians to adore the elements or not, vi, 318. In 1544, he aboliſhed the elevation of the hoſt. *ibid.* What he affirmed of the church of Rome, vi, 196. Made more ſubmiſſive to the church of Rome than he really was, vi, 197. The errors he committed in promoting reformation, vii, 183.
Lutherans, halt between two opinions, iii, 83.

M

Macauley, Mrs. her reflections on Charles 1ſts. parliament, iii, 21. *note.* Her obſervations on Roman catholics, iv, 22. *note.*
Macdonel, a character of his anſwer to an appeal to the common ſenſe of all chriſtian people, v, 490. *note.*
Maclaine, Dr. ſtrictures on his tranſlation of Moſheim's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 74. *note.* Reply to ſome of his remarks on the Confeſſional, do. v, 121. *note.* Remarks on his approbation of Archbp. Wake's intended accommodation between the Engliſh and Gallican churches, do. v, 136. Charges the members of the church of England with Arminianiſm, v. 413. *note.* His third Appendix, occaſional remarks on, vi, 289.
Magazine, Gentleman's, remarks upon a letter in, ii, 227. A demonſtration in it of the truth of the thirty-nine articles, vii, 212.

Magdalen houſe, ſuperſtitious circumſtance relating to that eſtabliſhment, Advertiſement, v, 13. *note.*

Magiſtrate, civil, his province with reſpect to religious eſtabliſhments, iv, 379.

Mahomet, his right, as founder of a ſect, of which he was the head, iv, 295.

Mahometans, what their religion requires, i, 110—111. Their ſentiments not eaſily known, iv, 326.

Maimbourg, his teſtimony in favour of Luther, iii, 17. *note.*

Man, a tract on his mortality, iii, 124. Controverſy on, iii, 126.

Manlove, publiſhes a defence of the immortality of the ſoul, iii, 367.

Markham, Dr. ſpecimen of his oratory, ii, 86—92.

Marriage, the articles of the church on this ſubject, in contradiction to the law of the land, vii, 207.

Martyrs in Queen Mary's days, what they thought of religious eſtabliſhments, i, 305.

Marvel, Andrew, his obſervations on the King of England's aſſuming the prieſthood, vii, 195. *note.*

Maſſacre, Iriſh, characterizes the ſpirit of popery during the reign of Charles I. iv, 79. *note.*

Mayhew, Dr. his reaſons for not replying to Mr. Apthorpe, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 93. *note.*

Meaux, Bp. of, remark on his writings, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 116. *note.*

Melancthon, infected with the ſpirit of the times, iii, 17. *note.* Is reproached by Luther, iii, 386. His opinion of the neceſſity of biſhops, iv, 310. *note.* His negociation with Archbp. Cranmer, for a common confeſſion of faith, to unite proteſtant churches, v, 270. His controverſy relating to the Interim, v, 271. Declares againſt any adoration in the ſacrament, vi. 319. Adviſes ſubſcription only to what is neceſſary, vii, 326, 339.

Meredith, Sir Wm. dedication to, vii, 38.

Methodiſts, how perſecuted, i, 311. How treated by the biſhops, i, 312. Sir T. B's opinion of, iv, 419. Whether inclined to popery, as aſſerted by Dr. Maclaine, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 130. *note.* No right to be called diſſenters, vi, 271. Their leaders how characteriſed, vii, 80.

Middleton, Dr. oppoſes the conceſſion made by Archbp. Wake to Boſſuet, vi, 331. *note.* Dr. his repreſentation of Cicero's religious opinions examined, v, 369. *note.* His derivation of the idolatry of the church of Rome, from the rites of paganiſm juſtified, v, 465. *note.* His expoſition of St. Paul's becoming all things to all men, v, 473.

Millar, Andrew, his objection to the title, Confeſſional, lxxxix.
Milton, Locke, Clarke, and Hoadly, their regard to the new teſtament, vii, 67. His Apology for Luther, iii, 27. *note.*
Miniſtry, candidate for, the nature of his examination, vi, 63.
Miſrepreſentation, a prime art of controverſy, vi, 188.
Montague, Mr. is engaged by Land as a champion for Arminian principles, v, 401. Incurs the cenſure of the houſe of Commons, v, 402. His cauſe recommended to King Charles I. v, 403. Obtains a pardon from the King, v, 409.
Moravian, biſhops, eſtabliſhed in America, ii, 43. Two of whom not to reſide in the ſame city together, ii, 47.
Moravians, ſcruple to take an oath or to ſerve in the army, ii, 44. Their conduct in Germany, ii, 45. Church, extolled by Archbp. Potter, ii, 49.
Mordecai, Benj. his Apology for embracing the chriſtian religion referred to, iv, 278.
Morley, Bp. his character by Calamy, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 86.
Moſes, how repreſented in the Divine Legation, ii, 302. Whence he had the idea of a kingdom of prieſts, iv, 301.
Moſheim, Dr. his character of the church of England, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 74. Remark on Dr. Maclaine's tranſlation of that paſſage, *ibid. note.*
Muræna, Apudius, degraded for refuſing to ſubſcribe to the laws of Auguſtus, vii, 324, 336.
Murphy, Mr. unfairneſs of his quotation, cxviii.
Myſtics, Seckendorf's account of that ſect, v, 240. *note.*
Myſtery, the conſequence of robbing the church of it, iii, 220.

N

Nazianzen, *Gregory*, his definition of chriſtianity, iv, 293.
Neal, his hiſtory of the puritans quoted, i, 278.
Neale, biſhop of Durham, Anecdote of him and Andrews, biſhop of Wincheſter, v, 507. *note.* Subſcriptions defended on his principles in the ſtyle of churchmen, v, 508—9. *note.*
Needham, Dr. Turberville, his dextrous eſcape from the inquiſition in Portugal, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 128. *note.*
Nelſon, his character, i, 183. His book on the feſtivals and faſts, quoted, *ibid.* 190.
New England, miſſionaries in, double the number of thoſe in any other American province, ii, 63. The firſt colony ſent thither by Lord Chief Juſtice Popham, vi, 244.

Newnham, Sir Edward, charge to the Grand Jury of Dublin, iv, 187.
New Teſtament, tranſlation of, by the gentlemen of Port Royal, i. 46.
Nicholas, Pope, is unjuſtly charged with admitting the decretals as of equal authority with the ſcriptures, v, 242. *note.*
Nichölls, Dr. Remarks on his Commentary on the xxxix Articles, v, 283. His expoſitions compared with thoſe of Dr. Bennet, v, 303.
Nichols, his controverſy with Mr. Pierce, i, 164.
North, Lord, his dexterity, vii, 75.
Nova Scotia, the great encouragement ſaid to be given to popery there, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 131. *note.*

O

Occaſional conformity, why oppoſed, and the act againſt it, how repealed, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 99.
Ogden, his ſermon on prayer quoted, iii, 150.
Omers, St. A college there belonging to the Engliſh jeſuits, iv, 165.
Ordination, the queſtions propoſed to prieſts, by the office of, a ſufficient ſecurity for their principles without farther ſubſcriptions, v, 509. Epiſcopal, not an indiſpenſable qualification for the miniſtry, by 13th. of Eliz. v, 294. The ſecond queſtion put by the biſhop to every candidate for, vii, 8.
Organiſt, the, of Dort, vii, 143.
Orleans, the ghoſt of, iii, 72.
Orthodoxy, what it ſhould mean, vii, 8.
Orton, Job, his remarks on the conſiderations on popery, xciii.
Oſborne, his account of the motives of Queen Elizabeth's aſſuming the ſupremacy over the church of England, v, 261. *note.*
Oxford, Bp. of, his ſermon before the ſociety for the propagation, &c. quoted, ii, 55.
Oxford, remarks on Mr. Jones's defence of that univerſity, from a reflection caſt on it by Fox, the martyrologiſt, v, 536.

P

Pamphlet, by a preſbyter, referred to and condemned, i, 162.
Papiſts, their grand engine, i, 168. Not to be ranked among chriſtians, i, 251. Some bigotted exhibit the true chriſtian character, iii, 37. Iriſh, endeavours made to exculpate them from the guilt of the maſſacre of the proteſtants, in 1641, iv, 41. *note.* Their enmity to the Proteſtant ſovereign of Great Britain, iv, 87. The penal laws againſt no more than neceſſary, iv, 91.
Paradiſe, how the term was underſtood by the Jews, ii, 188.

Parker, Archbp. converſation between him and Sir Thomas Wentworth, reſpecting the bill for eſtabliſhing the articles of the church of England, Preface to 2d. edit. v, 23. Inferences from this converſation, 24. Altered the articles of the church of England, v, 358. His explanation of the regal ſupremacy over the church, v, 381. Altered Cranmer's ſyſtem, vii, 5. His articles have been objected to by ſome biſhops in every age ſince his time, *ibid.* Admits that general councils may err, vii, 5.

Parliament, their authority, i, 185. Propoſals for an application to, for relief in matters of ſubſcription, vii, 1. Difficulty of in forwarding a petition to, vii, 8. Plan of petition to, propoſed, vii. 9. Subſcription, propoſals for an application to parliament for relief in, vii, 1. Act of, in behalf of Pope Urban, vi. Motives for, iv, 256. For relief of perſons who, by ſickneſs are diſabled from ſubſcribing to the act of uniformity, vi, 43.

Paul, Father, his convictions, wiſhes and conduct, iv, 282. His treatiſe on eccleſiaſtical benefices, quoted, vii, 105, 107.

Paul St. wiſhed for an intermediate ſtate of happineſs, ii, 207. Expoſition of his becoming all things to all men, v, 473. Altered his ſentiments with regard to the expediency of circumciſion, v, 474.

Paul's, Church, people went in crouds to hear the bible read, iv, 99.

Patriots, French, their ſtruggles to ſupport the pragmatic ſanction, iv, 13. *note.*

Peace, public, a perſon giving his hand to, and keeping his conſcience for God, vii, 330, 344.

Peckard, Mr. Peter, his examination, &c. xliii. Dr. Law's remarks on. *ibid.* His narrative ſuppreſſed. *ibid. note.* His narrative, xciv—cvii. His obſervations on Fleming's ſurvey, ii, 359. *note.*

People, the, generally averſe from reformation, iv, 373. *note.*

Perron, Cardinal, his opinion of Luther, iii, 64.

Perrot, Nicholas, his opinion how we gain the knowledge of the ſoul's immortality, iii, 179. His contempt of common opinions, *ibid.* His ſuppoſition compared with that of Arnauld and Bayle, iii, 181.

Perſecution always under the pretence of forwarding the intereſts of religion, iv, 368.

Petition of the Clergy, copy of, vii, 15. For relief in matters of ſubſcription, reflections on the fate of, vii, 62.

Petitioners, the general cry againſt them was, they are endeavouring to ruin the eſtabliſhment, vii, 72. Plea for, highly commended, iv, 400.

Pharifees, their belief in an immortal power in the foul, ii, 391.
Philelcutherus Cantabrigienfis, his character of the articles of the church of England, v, 341. His plea for fubfcription to them, v, 350.
Philofophers, Hermetic, their opinion of the Creator, iii, 109. *note.*
Phylacteries, broad, their origin, i, 143.
Piety, how defcribed by Archbp. Secker, vii, iii. *note.*
Pifa, remonftrance of the council of, to Maxamillian, iv, 112. *note.*
Plague, in 1665, how many perfons died of the, ii, 174.
Pleas, political, for prefent forms, iv, 296. *note.*
Plot, *Popifh*, reality of it doubted, iv, 80. *note.*
Pole, *Reginald*, his life, obfervations on, iv, 50.
Pomponatius, *Peter*, his book on the immortality of the foul, iii, 58. Expofed to the abufe of the popifh clergy, iii, 59. His curious Syllogifm, iii, 61. His meaning miftaken, by Mr. Bayle, *ibid.*
Pomponia Grecia, a noble lady put to death, as guilty of a new religion, vii, 324, 335.
Pope, *Mr.* his belief in the immortality of the foul, ii, 228. *note.*
Pope, a parliamentary one in England, iv, 253. Of Rome, how characterized by the Engliſh parliament, iv, 195. *note.* Claims the King-fhip in Great Britain and Ireland, iv, 246. *note.* His fovereignty, iv, 413. His authority difputed in catholic countries, as well before the reformation as fince, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 126. *note.* By what means he loft his fupremacy, vii, 190.
Popery, conſiderations on, how received, xcii. Job Orton's remarks on, xciii. Gaining ground, i, 151. What intereſt it has in the queſtion of the intermediate ſtate, iii, 44. Objected to, as an anti-chriſtian ſuperſtition, iv, 102. On account of its meanneſs, iv, 104. *note.* The conſummation of religious tyranny, Advertiſement, v, 5.
Powell, Dr. aſſerts the indeterminate ſenſe of the Articles of the church, before the univerſity of Cambridge, v, 512. Suppoſes the general ſubſcription of young perſons to the articles, leaves them room to improve in theology afterward, v, 524. Remarks on his ſermon, v, 525. *note.* Remarks on his ſermon in defence of ſubſcriptions, vi, 1. His expedient that perſons may ſubſcribe on the authority of others, vii, 226.
Predeſtination, and the final perſeverance of the elect, the ſubject of a conteſt between Archbp. Bancroft and Dr. Reynolds, at the Hampton-court conference, v, 382. Undignified clergymen forbid to preach on it, v, 400. This prohibition extended to Deans and Biſhops, v, 409. Bp. Davenant, reprimanded in

council for preaching on it, v, *ib.* The doctrine of it favoured by some late philosophers, v, 417.

Presbyterians, in James I. reign, hoped for an ecclesiastical revolution, vi, 247.

Pretender, his Declaration in 1715, and 1745, iv, 91. *note.* His character, iv, 176. The spring of the war in 1756, iv, 237.

Prideaux, Dr. his account of the religious ignorance of candidates for holy orders, after university education, v, 520. *note.* Proposes erecting a new college in each university, under the name of Drone hall, v, 521. *note.*

Priestley, Dr. his character by Mr. Blackburne, xlix. *note.* His Essay on church discipline censured, iv, 343. *note.*

Priests, kingdom of, whence Moses borrowed the idea, iv, 301.

Promptuaria, the, considered, iii, 103. *note.*

Protestant Teachers, their great duty to revive the study of the scriptures, iv, 100.

Protestants, their original name, iv, 366. First, their original principles, iv, 372. Explode the allegorical explanation of scripture, iv, 416. Their first principles of separation from the church of Rome, v, 145. Relapse into the error of establishing uniformity of opinion, v, 148. This the parent of sectaries, v, 149. Their defence against the charge of want of unity brought against them by the papists, v, 152. The tendency of established confessions, v, 160. All the persuasions of them upon an equal footing of independence, v, 189. How far this equality has been observed by different parties, existing in one state, v, 192. An examination of the Apology of the Remonstrants in Holland, v, 195. Heresies are perpetuated and multiplied by church censures, v, 202. The tenor of the subscription required to the articles of the church of England, v, 354. The interests of civil society not dependent on doctrinal points in religion, v, 361. German, transmit a forged writing to England, vi, 320.

Puritans, how treated by the established church, Preface to 1st. edit. v, 77. No difference in matters of doctrine between them and episcopal churchmen, in the early time of the reformation, v, 376. Contests between them and the bishops, on their refusing to subscribe to the episcopal hierarchy, v, 377. Their objection to the 16th. article of the church, v, 380. *note.* Object to subscription of doctrinals, after the Hampton-court conference, v, 385. Origin of the term, v, 399. Their tenets compared with Arminianism, in a political view, v, 415. The first that went to America, vi, 243.

Q

Queſnel, Father Paſquier, his doctrines condemned by the bull Unigenitus, v, 426. His dying declarations, v, *ib.*

Queſtions, diſputable, are generally on ſubjects out of the reach of our knowledge, iv, 280.

R

Ravilliac, derived his principles from the Jeſuits, iv, 18. *note.*

Real preſence, why the paſſage in King Edward's articles againſt it was ſtruck out, on the review of them in Queen Elizabeth's reign, v, 244.

Reformation in national churches, a difficult taſk, ii, 124. Public, the hazards of attempting, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 56. Conduct of thoſe who are deterred from proſecuting it, and acquieſce under public errors, do. v, 59. The adverſaries of it pointed out, do. v, *ib.* The obſtacles to it, do. v, 67. Inducements to attempt it, do. v, 71. See CHURCH OF ENGLAND. Proteſtant, the principles of, vii, 3.

Reformed churches, examination of Dr. Maclaine's poſition, that they were never at ſuch a diſtance from the ſpirit and doctrine of the church of Rome, as at this day, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 121. *note.* Agree with the church of Rome in the doctrine of the ſeparate exiſtence of the ſoul, v, 129. *note.*

Reformer, one in Germany, to obtain the protection of a Sovereign Prince, allowed him to have two wives, iv, 213. *note.*

Reformers, the eſtabliſhment of their doctrine in 1552, and infringement of their principles, *ibid.* Oath, to be taken by every fellow at Trinity college, Cambridge, vii, 3. *note.* In Queen Elizabeth's reign, their character, i, 150. Ground work on their proceedings, iv, 309. Remarks on their conduct in defending themſelves againſt popiſh calumnies, v, 237. The conſequences of their intolerant ſpirit, v, 240.

Regium Donum, for what given, vii, 181. *note.*

Regis, Father John Francis, his life referred to, xciii.

Religion, force in, produces hypocriſy, i, 145. Externals in, on what foundation they ſtand, i, 141. In what it conſiſts, i, 147. Externals in, not to be ſtrenuouſly enforced, i, 151. Natural, liable to be miſtaken, i, 169. Intereſts of, meaning of the phraſe, iv, 352. Cannot refer to any temporal advantage, iv, 360. Chriſtian, does not provide for the intereſt of particular ſects, iv, 359. The etymology and true ſenſe of the word, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 89. Politician's, the fortieth article of which, vii, 75.

Remonſtrants, cenſured by the Calviniſts, iii, 90. Accuſed of Socinianiſm, iii, 91. In Holland, how treated in conſequence of the Synod at Dort, v, 193. Inconſiſtency of their own conduct afterward, v. 194. Their Apology, v, *ib.* An examination of this Apology, v, 195. Admit the right of private judgment in comparing confeſſions with ſcripture, v, 208. Their motive in this conceſſion, v, 209.

Repoſitory, Theological, an Eſſay in, to prove that the reſurrection takes place immediately after death, iii, 348.

Reſtoration, ſtrict meaſures taken at, not approved by Dr. Whichcot, vii, 174. *note.*

Reynolds, Dr. Alterations in the articles of the church of England propoſed by him at the Hampton-court conference, v, 383.

Review, monthly, cenſured, iii, 246.

Richlieu, Cardinal, his ſcientific knowledge not able to free him from ſuperſtition, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 120. *note.*

Rimius, his hoſtility to the Moravians, ii, 47.

Rogers, how he underſtood the xxiſt. article of the church, i, 155. His Expoſition of the thirty-nine articles, the only one publiſhed by authority of the church of England, v, 346. His account of the diſputes between the biſhops and the puritans, on the ſubject of epiſcopal authority, v, 379. Anecdote related by him, concerning Zanchius, v, 422. *note.*

Romaine, his reſolution, if the petition of the clergy had been granted, vii, 77.

Roman catholics, how far intitled to toleration, iv, 65. The doctrines they hold not the only thing objectionable, iv, 68.

Rome, church of, conſiders ſcripture allegorically, iv, 413. Myſtically, iv, 416. An inquiry, by what means it has intitled itſelf to the favour of the reformed churches, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 141. Avails itſelf of the riſe of ſectaries among the reformers, v, 152. Inquiry when it began to admit traditions as of equal authority with the ſcriptures, v, 242. *note.* The idolatry of, derivable from Pagan inſtitutions, v, 464. *note.*

Royal family, reſtraint upon, with regard to marriage, inconſiſtent with the 32d. of the articles, vii, 207.

Rules, proper for teaching chriſtianity, iv, 350.

Ruſhworth, his account of Montague's being recommended to King Charles I. by Laud and other biſhops, v, 403.

Ruſt, Bp. his opinion of the clergy of the church of England, v, 183. *note.*

Rutherforth, his charge referred to, iv, 264.
Rutherforth, Dr. contends for the right of eſtabliſhing teſts, vi, 112. Remarks on his vindication of the right of proteſtant churches to require ſubſcription, &c. Preface to 2d. edit. v, 21. Remarks on the defence of his charge, do. v, 33. *note.* His idea of a chriſtian church compared with Mr. Locke, from whom it is quoted, do. v, *ib.* Compared with Bp. Warburton, do. v, 38. Examination of his ſyſtem of church government, do. v, 41. This compared with Mr. Locke, do. v, 43. Examination of his account of the duty of church governors, do. v, 44. Does not think a reception of the ſcriptures as the word of God, ſufficient ſecurity for faith and a pure conſcience, v, 160. Teaches that ſubſcription is not required of laymen, who are left to the exerciſe of private judgment, v, 178. *note.* His uncharitable reflection on diſſenting miniſters, v, 184. *note.* His defence of ſubſcriptions inquired into, v, 185. *note.* Examination of his account of the apoſtles method of condemning falſe doctrines, v, 238. *note.* His contradictory poſitions reſpecting lay-aſſent to the articles of the church of England, as a qualification for communion, v, 251. *note.*

S

Seckendorf, his hiſtory of Lutheraniſm, iv, 413. *note.*
Sacramental Teſt, as a qualification for holding civil offices, obſervations on it, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 97.
Sadducees, Grotius opinion of, ii, 400. *note.* Le Clerc's opinion of, ii, 402.
Saint, an additional one added to the golden Legend, iv, 118. *note.*
Sanderſon, Dr. his objections to ſalvoes, for taking the covenant, v, 434. His ſalvoes for taking the engagement, v, 436. His dextrous equivocations applied to ambiguous expreſſions in the engagement, v, 438. Teaches that the obligation to obſerve it, after ſubſcribing, depends upon the continuance of the power that impoſed it, v, 444.
Salvation, the means of, like their author, i, 149.
Savoy, Ducheſs of, tendered a proteſtation againſt the bill for the Hanover ſucceſſion, iv, 242. *note.*
Savoy conference, *management* made uſe of to draw diſſenters into begin firſt, i, 320. Account of, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 81. Compared to the council of Trent, do. v, 97.
Saxony, the Elector of, his opinion of Henry VIII. iv, 390. *note.*

Scalliger, contends that the ancient chriſtians had no conception of an intermediate ſtate, iii, 303. *note.*

Scepticiſm, has a tendency to lead to popery, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 119.

Science, how far the improvements in it ſecure mankind from relapſing into Romiſh ſuperſtition, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 114.

Scripture, what the juſt interpretation of, iv, 411. Methods of interpreting it, iv, 412. Rules for ſtudying, where to be found, *ibid. note.* How interpreted by the church of Rome, iv, 413.

Scriptures, advantages attending the free ſtudy of, i, 44. Subſcription to, no evidence of men's opinions, iv, 398. *note.* A diſcourſe on the ſtudy of, iv, 405. Study of, an important duty, iv, 407. Very liable to be miſinterpreted, iv, 408. How they are to be ſtudied, iv, 420. The beſt explainers of themſelves, iv, 425. Dr. Hartley's objections to ſubſcribing to their divine authority, v, 513. Remarks on the various copies of them, v, 514. No variations in them affect the eſſential points of religion, v, 516.

Seagrave, his remarks on the church of England clergy departing from their articles, v, 355. *note.* Teaches that the Prince only is concerned in ſecuring government againſt nonconformiſts, v, 361. *note.*

Seckendorf, his account of a popiſh ſect of fanatics, ſuppoſed to be the myſtics, v, 240. *note.* His teſtimony in favour of Luther, iii, 17. *note.* Wiſhed to conceal Luther's ſentiments reſpecting an intermediate ſtate, iii, 394.

Secker, Archbp. announces his diſpleaſure at the conduct of Mr. Blackburne, xviii. His indignation againſt the Confeſſional, xxxiii, xxxv. Diſcovers the author of, *ibid.* Seeks the aid of Dr. Balguy, Rotherham, and Ridley, xxxvi. When he died, xxxvii. His orders to his executors, xxxviii. Letter concerning biſhops in America, commentary on, ii, 1. His deſire to convert the diſſenters, ii, 3. His plan propoſed, ii, 10. His admonition for his brethren, ii, 27. His inconſiſtency ſhewn, ii, 28. His black book, ii, 95. Charged with employing ſpies, *ibid.* His ſixteenth lecture on the church Catechiſm, iii, 282. Was bred among the diſſenters, iii, 283. Is ſaid never to have taken preſbyterian orders, iii, 283. Preached a probation ſermon to a diſſenting congregation. *ibid.* Diſcovered an inclination to abridge others of the liberty which he himſelf had taken, iii, 284. Studied phyſic, *ibid.* His apologiſts pay little attention to facts, *ibid. note.* Maintains that the ſouls of all men continue after death, iii, 287. His plea for church authority, and unneceſſary

doctrines, Advertiſement, v, 6. His charge quoted, vii, 3. *note.* His propagation ſermon quoted and conſidered, vii, 68. *note.*

Sectaries, the occaſion of them among the firſt reformers, v, 148. Are perpetuated and multiplied by church cenſures, v, 203. How accounted for by the firſt reformers, v, 241.

Sects, of what accuſed, i, 155.

Selden, Mr. an anecdote from his table-talk, iv, 253. His opinion of ſubſcription to the articles of the church of England, Preface to 2d. edit. v, 28. *note.*

Sermon, on old Chriſtmas-day, i, 173.

Sharpe, Dr. Remarks on his viſitation charges, i, 327. Notes, on his rules of caution for examining the doctrine of the Trinity, i, 347.

Shakeſpeare, Warburton's edition, remarks on, ii, 267. *note.*

Sherlock, Bp. his ſermon on the rebellion referred to, i, 152. His letter on the earthquakes referred to, *ibid.* His thankſgiving ſermon before the commons quoted, *ibid.* His conference with Mr. Hooper, ii, 59. The conduct of his commiſſary in Barbadoes, *ibid.* Diſavows any wiſh of ſending biſhops to America, ii, 60. *note.*

Shuckford, Dr. his ſermon in defence of the liturgy quoted, vi, 201.

Sidney, Algernon, his character by Bp. Burnet, iv, 291. Sir Philip, his confeſſion of faith juſt before his death, iv, 292.

Sinclair, Francis, his account of the Homilies of the church of England, v, 305. Father, his expoſition of the 20th. article, vii, 86.

Sleeping in death, when intended by the phraſe in ſcripture, ii, 213.

Sleidan, his teſtimony in favour of Luther, iii, 17. *note.*

Smith, ſubſcribes the articles of the church of England conditionally, v, 301. *note.*

Smollet, his obſervations on France, iv, 167.

Sprat, his hiſtory of the royal ſociety quoted, iii, 10. *note.*

Society, its ſubſiſtence not dependent on doctrinal forms of religion, v, 360. The true uſe of religion to it, v, 363. The advantages of toleration to it, v, *ib.*

Socinian, why are you not a? Mr. Blackburne's anſwer to, cxx.

Socinianiſm, conſiſtent with the higheſt degrees of piety, learning, &c. ii, 224.

Socinus, gave a patronymic to opinions maintained by various perſons long before, ii, 224. *note.*

Soul, loſing the, for the ſake of Chriſt, what meant by, ii, 203. Immortality of, inconſiſtent with a tranſient future ſtate, ii, 305.

Inferred from natural reaſon, ii, 308. If naturally immortal, then the doctrines of redemption, reſtoration, reſurrection, &c. unneceſſary, ii, 311. The queſtion whether it always thinks, iii, 350. A gold medal offered for the beſt diſſertation to prove that the ſoul diſtinct from the body enjoys the faculties of thinking and acting, iii, 337. The notion of its immortality independent on the chriſtian revelation, bred among the ſchoolmen of the twelfth and three following centuries, iii, 365. Its ſeparate exiſtence, a tenet common to the church of Rome and reformers, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 129. *note.* The doctrine of the ſleep of it condemned by King Edward's articles, and refuted by Bp. Law, v, 203.

Southwell. Sir Robt. miſrepreſented by Arnauld, iv, 249.

Spirit, Eſſay on, quoted and commended, i, 165.

State, intermediate, not a ſcripture, doctrine in anſwer to Mr. Goddard's ſermon, ii, 179. Arguments againſt by Dr. Law, ii, 181—2. Does not depend on a reſurrection, ii, 183. Muſt be a ſtate of rewards and puniſhments, *ibid.* Thief, penitent, in poſſeſſion of happineſs before the reſurrection of Chriſt, if there be an intermediate ſtate, *ibid.* The promiſe made to him no encouragement to a death-bed repentance, ii, 185. A doctrine generally believed in the church, iii, 51. Doctrine of, overthrown by a canon of the council of Florence, iii, 51. Writers upon, iii, 244. A popular doctrine among the common people, ii, 218. A diſbelief of it not neceſſarily a ſocinian doctrine, ii, 221. Future, what as taught by chriſtian revelation, ii, 293.

State, Eccleſiaſtical, when it hath no power to command, vii, 329, 343.

States, two ſucceſſive, of rewards and puniſhment, not to be reconciled, ii, 184.

Stebbing, Dr. his juſtification of the deciſions of ſynods examined, v, 197. *Note*, v, 200, 212. His defence of a ſtrict ſubſcription to the articles of the church of England for admiſſion to the miniſtry, v, 323.

Steffe, Mr. his letters on the intermediate ſtate referred to, iii, 43. *note.* Anſwered by Dr. Dawſon, iii, 363. *note.*

Stegman, his Brevis Diſquiſitio, iii, 111. Miſrepreſents Luther, iii, 114.

Stegman Joachin, Adviſes to diſcard all human authority, iii, 112.

Stephen, St. his dying prayer explained, ii, 206.

Stillingfleet, Bp. his objection to Locke's poſition, iii, 212. His opinion of the ſoul's immateriality, ii, 405. *note.*

Story, Bp. his treatiſe on the prieſthood quoted, i, 142—4. *note.*

Students, in both univerſities, an addreſs to, vi, 3. Their duty to conſider before they ſubſcribe, vi, 7. Offer themſelves as candidates for orders when they have taken the firſt degree, vi, 8. The uſual method of probation, *ibid.* Competent judges of the nature of ſubſcription, vi, 10.

Strype, his reflection on the anabaptiſts, iii, 84. His opinion of ſyſtematical teſts in religion, v, 276. *note.*

Style, new, reaſons for the zeal againſt, xix.

Subſcriber, believes the articles *true, uſeful*, and *neceſſary*, vii, 326.

Subſcription, eſtabliſhed with reſpect to diſſenters, vii, 181. *note.* Eccleſiaſtical, gives witneſs of preſent conſent only, vii, 325, 337. Ought not to lead into a ſnare, *ibid.* Muſt ſignify approbation, vii, 330. Dr. Heberden's remarks on, lxxxix. To articles, &c. is wholly political, vii, 324. Is an inſtrument of unity. *ibid.*

Superſtition, its nature, i, 143. Cicero's obſervations on it, v, 367. *note.*

Sykes, Dr. an examination of his anſwer to Dr. Waterland's caſe of Arian ſubſcription, v, 343. Acknowledges an equivocal ſenſe in the words of the articles of the church of England, v, 429.

Sylveſter, Matthew, a defender of the immortality of the ſoul, iii, 368.

Sylvius, his clerical complaiſance, iv, 398. *note.*

T

Taylor's Bp. Ductor Dubitantium quoted, i, 129. His judgment on articles and forms of confeſſion in particular churches, vii, 324. A candid and explicit caſuiſt, vii, 276. Notes on, vii, 335.

Tenniſon, Archbp. his bequeſt of 1000l. towards eſtabliſhing biſhops in America, ii, 29. Explained, ii, 30—2. Memoirs of, referred to, ii, 35. His character, vi, 269.

Tenths and firſt fruits ſettled on the clergy, i, 307. Their capital in 1754, *ibid.* How diſpoſed of, *ibid.*

Tertullian, a paſſage from, brought by Dr. Middleton, which mentions the cuſtom of praying for the dead, iii, 160.

Theology, improvements in, of two ſorts, *real* and *artificial*, vi, 100. Dogmatic, ſaid to be eſſential to chriſtianity, vii, 282.

Tillotſon, Archbp. his opinion of a good chriſtian, i, 100. An advocate of an intermediate ſtate, ii, 222. Remarks on a paragraph of one of his ſermons, ii, 244. Poſtſcript to, ii, 254. His ſermon at Mr. Gouge's funeral, quoted, ii, 326. Acknowledged the immortality of the ſoul is not expreſsly revealed in the bible, iii, 371. His account of a conference toward a comprehenſion with the diſſenters, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 87. Prevailed

on Bp. Burnet, to undertake an expoſition of the articles of the church of England, v, 216. An examination of his ſentiments with regard to church authority and ſubſcriptions, v, 218. Is injuriouſly treated by his biographer Dr. Birch, v, 224. *note.* His principle, aſſerting the civil magiſtrate's ſuperintending power over religion, examined, v, 370. *note.* His conceſſion with regard to this poſition, v, 372. *note.* His opinion of the Athanaſian creed referred to, vi, 205.

Tindal, remark on a ſtricture made by him on Rapin the hiſtorian, v, 414.

Tindal's Tranſlation of the bible objected to, vi, 147.

Toleration, act of, Dr. Jortin's opinion of, i, 310. Religious, its advantages to civil communities, v, 363. King James's objections to it, v, 398.

Toll, his letter to Warburton, vii, 91.

Toplady, Mr. his reflections on the tendency of ſubſcriptions to confeſſions of faith, v, 419. *note.* Inquiry into his quarrel with the author of the Confeſſional, *ibid.* His inconſiſtency in defending the Articles and Homilies, v, 420. *note.*

Towgood, Mr. Micaiah, his diſſenting gentleman's letters quoted, i, 152.

Traditions, inquiry when the church of Rome firſt began to admit them as of equal authority with the ſcriptures, v, 242. *note.*

Trimming in religious matters, remarks on it, v, 222.

Trinity, the doctrine of it eminently defended by the Doctors Waterland and Bennet, without agreeing between themſelves, v, 282. Dr. Waterland's notions of the damnatory clauſes in the Athanaſian Creed concerning it, v, 313. Expediency of a reform in the church liturgy reſpecting it, v, 490.

Truth, the preſervation of it admitted by Bp. Clayton to depend on the exiſtence and exerciſe of religious freedom, v, 364.

Tucker, Dr. his ſix ſermons quoted, vii, 124. His letter to Dr. Kippis, quoted and conſidered, vii, 127. The poſtulata which he deſires to erect a demonſtration, vii, 95. His maxims, vii, 179. *note.* Reply to his ſtrictures, i, 283. His account of the diſſenters at Briſtol anſwered, i, 291.

Twyſden, his Hiſtorical Vindication of the church of England, quoted, i, 91.

Tyndall, William, defends Luther againſt Sir Thomas More, iii, 65. Did not ſuſpect he had any adverſaries except the papiſts, iii, 67. His proteſt, iii, 68. Not to be found in his former edition to the New Teſtament, iii, 69.

U V

Uniformity, act of, its conſequence, i, 159. Act of, 14 Car. II. how far it affects the ſtatute 13 Eliz. c. 12, requiring ſubſcription to the articles of the church of England, Preface to 2d. edit. v, 26. *note.*

Unigenitus, the famous bull ſo called, on what occaſion publiſhed, v, 426.

Univerſities, Engliſh, reject Dr. Buſby's offer of founding catechiſtical lectures in them, v, 520. Dr. Prideaux's remarks on the religious ignorance of candidates for holy orders, after being educated in them, *ibid. note.* Obſervations on their refuſal of Dr. Buſby's offer, v, 522. See WARBURTON.

Urban VI, Pope, account of, iv, 256.

Valla Laurentius, the firſt to reſcue the ſcriptures from the barbariſms of the monks, iv, 366. *note.* Eraſmus made great uſe of his book, iv, 367.

Vaughan, Bp. his wiſh, vii, 80. *note.*

Vindication of the Right of proteſtant churches to require ſubſcription, &c. Remarks on that publication, Preface to 2d. edit. v, 20. See RUTHERFORTH.

Virginia, an account of by Sir Richard Baker, vi, 244.

Viſion, beatific, not expected by the fathers of the church till the reſurrection, iii, 51.

Voltaire, his profeſſions and conduct, iii, 130. *note.*

Voſſius, his book De Deo, written againſt by King James I. v, 387.

W

Wake, Archbp. his opinion why the primitive chriſtians prayed for the dead, iii, 162. Imagines that the ancient chriſtians had ſome warrant for praying for the dead, iii, 202. His plan for a union between the Engliſh and Gallican churches, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 133. Reflections on his conduct in this negotiation, ditto, v, 136. *note.* Remarks on his conduct with reſpect to Dr. Sacheverell, do. v, 138. His inconſiſtency with regard to the ſchiſm bill, v, 500. Did he form a project of an union between the churches of England and France? vi, 292. To compaſs this, would he have given up any thing on the part of the church of England? *ibid.* His conceſſion to Boſſuet, vi, 330. *note.* Oppoſed by Dr. Middleton, vi, 331. *note.* His letter to the church of Zurich, vi, 342. Brought in a bill againſt the Arian

hereſy, vi, 344.
Walpole, Sir Robert, his letter to Bp. Sherlock, when written, ii, 4. His Anecdotes of painting, quoted, iii, 10. *note*. Application to by the proteſtant diſſenters, vii, 75. His ſpeech to them, vii, 76.
Warburton, Dr. profits by Mr. Blackburne's remarks, xxv. His manœuvre, *ibid*. Correſpondence between, and Dr. Law, cviii—cxvi. His paradox ſolved, i, 315. Remarks on his account of the ſentiments of the early Jews, ii, 261. His criticiſm on the word Hades, ii, 289. *note*. Defence of his remarks on the ſentiments of the early Jews concerning the ſoul ii, 436. His ſtrictures on the ſleep of the ſoul examined, iii. 250. His idea of a chriſtian church, Preface to 2d. edit. v, 38. Remarks on his alliance between church and ſtate, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 101. Strictures on his defence of the Fathers in his Julian, v, 458. His apology for Cicero's oratorical craft analyſed, v, 495. *note*. His defence of the univerſities, in the Preface to the 2d. edit. of his Divine Legation, omitted in the ſubſequent editions, v, 521. *note*. His alliance anſwered by Toll, vii, 91. *note*.
Ward, Bp. his conduct in reſpect of the comprehenſion ſcheme, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 84.
Waterland, Dr. his notions of ſubſcription to the articles of the church of England, examined, v, 310. His ſentiments on the damnatory clauſes in the Athanaſian Creed, v, 313. How he reconciles the obligation to ſubſcription with the right of private judgment, v, 340. Endeavours to prove the articles anti-calviniſtical, v, 428.
Watſon, Bp. his tracts referred to, cxvi. His chemical Eſſays quoted, iii, 109. *note*. His Eſſays on chemiſtry referred to and quoted, iii, 289. *note*.
Watſon, John, his ſermon quoted and commended, i, 164.
Watts, Dr. his philoſophical Eſſays quoted, iii, 116.
Welchman, his tract on the articles, vii, 24.
Wentworth, Sir Peter, his converſation with Archbp. Parker, reſpecting the bill for eſtabliſhing the articles of the church of England, Preface to 2d. edit. v, 23. Inferences from this converſation, 24. Is ſent to the tower on this occaſion, do. v, 26. *note*.
Weſley, Mr. his opinion of the intermediate ſtate, ii, 329. Mr. John, his Commentary on 2 Cor. iii, 6. iv, 417. Patronized a tranſlation of the life of Xavier, vii, 83.
Wetſtein, his greek teſtament commended, iv, 423.

Whichcot, Dr. his diſapprobation of the meaſures taken at the reſtoration, vii, 174. *note.*

Whiſton, Mr. his peculiarities, i, 369. His ſaying in the life of Clarke, i, 373. Upbraids Archbp. Wake with having made an attempt to introduce the inquiſition into the church of England, vi, 344.

Whitby, Dr. his opinion of church government, by apoſtolic ſucceſſion, Preface to 2d. edit. v, 43.

White, Mr. his defence againſt the diſſenting gentleman's letter quoted, i, 153, 154. His character, i, 319. His book on purgatory noticed by the houſe of Commons, iii, 176. His political opinions, iii, 178. Remarks on his reply to Dr. Chandler's advice to the church of England, on the ſubject of ſubſcriptions, v, 279. His teſtimony of the willingneſs of the late King, to admit of a reformation in the church, v, 451. But alleges an indiſpoſition of the people to admit of a reform, v, 452.

White, Thomas, his book de Animarum ſtatu, an account of, iii, 141. Oppoſes the common doctrine of purgatory, iii, 143. His account of purgatory, iii, 147. His notion of praying for things predeſtinated, iii, 148. His ſyſtem conſidered, iii, 150.

Whitefield, his ſermons characterized, vii, 90. *note.*

Whitgift, Archbp. ſuppreſſes the publication of the harmony of the Confeſſions, in England, v, 154. Pronounces books to diſturb the church, more pernicious than lewd books, v, 499.

Whittingham, Dean of Durham, his letter to Lord Leiceſter, vi, 277.

Whittle, condemned for the murder of his wife and two children, iv, 74. *note.*

Wild, *Jonathan*, his defence at the old Bailey referred to, ii, 458.

Wilkins, Dr. his letter to a friend, vi, 303. Obſervations on it, vi. 305. Is a key to the project of an union with the Gallican church, *ibid.*

William, King, his deſire to oblige the diſſenters, ii, 81. Under him proviſion made for the ſecurity of Britiſh liberty, iv, 29. Various plots to aſſaſſinate him, iv, 85. *note.* Conſidered the ſubject of toleration in a true light, iv, 373.

Williams, Bp. conſidered the thirty-nine articles of the church of England, only as articles of peace, v, 220.

Wollaſton, Mr. his opinion of the neceſſity of church reformation, vii, 199.

Woman, an account of one in St. Martin's-lane, who ſlept from Friday to Tueſday, iii, 353.

Words, the faſcination of ſome, iii, 349.

Works eccleſiaſtical, what, iv, 424. *note.*
Worſhip, public, expreſſions in, different from what is preſcribed in the goſpel, ii, 123. Unity of, what meant by, vi, 53.
Worthington, Mr. his Eſſay on man's redemption, quoted, i, 117. Dr. remarks on his account of the preſent principles and practiſes of the Roman catholics, Preface to 1ſt. edit. v, 125. *note.*
Writers, who of them would by general ballot be condemned to everlaſting ſilence, iii, 7. Controverſial, by whom they would be proſcribed, iii, 7.
Wyvill, Rev. C. Dedication to, i.

X

Xaverius, Saint, ſome account of, iv, 137.

Y

York, Duke of, his marriage with the Earl of Clarendon's daughter noticed, vii, 213.

Z.

Zanchius, remarks on his ſubſcription to the Augſburgh confeſſion, and Straſburgh articles, v, 421. *note.*
Zinzendorf, ordained Bp. at Liſſa, 47.

A TABLE

OF

TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE,

referred to in

THESE WORKS.

Chap.	*Ver.*	*Vol.*	*Page.*
GENESIS.			
3	19	2	349
4	9	3	381
9	5	—	327
15	15	—	297
17	7,8	2	377
25	8	3	387
26	15	1	63
31	42	3	312
37	35	—	297
42	7,8	—	136
EXODUS.			
3	16	3	312
5	—	5	379
19	5,6	1	142
—	6	4	301
20	11	1	189
28	38	2	206
LEVITICUS.			
1	3,4	2	206
14	5,7	—	—
19	15	4	264
22	19,27	2	206
23	2	—	—
27	30	1	141
NUMBERS.			
11	29	1	69
16	24	3	206
DEUTERONOMY.			
4	2	7	24
6	6,9	1	142,143
12	32	7	24
29	29	1	259
33	11,16,23	2	206
34	6	3	330
JOSHUA.			
1	7	7	24
JUDGES.			
13	23	2	206

I KINGS.

Chap.	Ver.	Vol.	Page.
12	31	4	302
13	33	—	302
22	—	—	302

II CHRONICLES.

11	14,15	4	302
13	9—11	—	302
18	—	—	302

ESTHER.

9	27—28	1	138

JOB.

2	11	3	201
3	10—12	—	204
5	13	4	332
7	20	2	206
9	22	3	206
14	13	6	146

PSALMS.

6	5	2	240
19	1	1	148
50	9	2	206
94	2	4	332
119	18	4	427
—	18—125	1	62
149	6,7	2	28

PROVERBS.

11	1	2	206
12	2	—	206
15	8	—	206
28	12,28	3	104
30	5,6	7	24

ECCLESIASTES.

3	19	3	217
—	21	2	279
6	3	3	204

Chap.	Ver.	Vol.	Page
6	6	3	202
9	5	2	437 443,4 452
—	5,10	—	289
—	10	—	240
—	—	3	393
12	7	2	349
—	—	—	282

ISAIAH.

38	18	2	241
—	—	—	289
51	1	5	192
56	7	2	206
—	10,1	1	79
60	7	2	206
64	15	3	386

JEREMIAH.

5	31	4	299
6	20	2	206
7	22,23	1	142
50	6	—	79

EZEKIEL.

20	40,41	2	206
34	2—10	1	79
—	11,12	—	64
43	27	2	206

DANIEL.

12	4	4	370
—	10	3	104

HOSEA.

4	9	1	80

JOEL.

2	28	1	169

AMOS.

Chap.	Ver.	Vol.	Page.
5	22	2	206

JONAH.

4	11	3	327

ZECHARIAH.

10	2	1	79

MALACHI.

1	8,10,13	2	206

ESDRAS.

4	41,42	3	102
7	32	—	102

ECCLUS.

44	16	2	301

I. MACCABEES.

4	56	1	138
6 & 7	—	2	396

MATTHEW.

2	12	3	206
5	13—15	1	79
7	13	—	186
—	28	2	334
8	22	4	103
—	24	1	83—84
2	38	—	81
9	13	—	121
10	27	5	233
—	28	2	201
—	28	—	204
—	28	3	317
11	12	2	428
—	23	—	240
12	7	5	43
—	15	3	206
13	30	2	170
13	54	2	334
14	—	1	83
15	1—21	—	105
—	9	7	25
16	18	2	240
—	25	3	386
—	25,26	2	204
18	15—17	4	343
—	17	—	103
—	20	1	65
19	7	2	428
20	4	3	203
21	15	1	59
—	28,31,40,1,2		426
22	23	—	329
—	23—33	—	315
—	27	3	253
—	29	2	378
—	29—32	—	375
—	30	—	255
—	—	—	389
—	31	—	318
—	32	3	307, 311
—	42	1	57
23	8	—	185
—	9,10	5	530
—	13	2	334
—	23	1	140
24	14	—	71
26	24	3	204
27	5	—	206
—	51	1	58
28	19	—	85

MARK.

1	22	2	334
4	33	1	86
—	38	—	83
6	2	2	334
—	34	1	80
—	38	—	81

Chap.	Ver.	Vol.	Page.
7	1,&c.	1	105
—	4,8	4	302
10	14	1	58
—	24,26	2	334
—	17	1	69
11	18	2	334
12	18—27	—	315
—	25	3	315
14	21	—	204

LUKE.

2	25	7	66
—	42	2	334
—	46	1	58
3	38	3	33
4	22—32	2	334
5	12	1	69
7	41,43	2	426
10	16	4	103
—	27	1	57
—	21	—	59
—	30—37	2	426
11	52	—	334
—	9—10	1	66
12	3	5	233
—	4,5	2	202
15	—	—	426
—	5	1	80
16	—	3	133
—	19	2	424
—	19	—	198
—	22,23	3	89
19	9	2	192
20	—	3	360
—	27—38	2	315
—	36	—	255
—	37—38	—	334—6
—	38	—	381
23	43	3	89
—	43	2	185,187 189

Chap.	Ver.	Vol.	Page.
23	46	2	205

JOHN.

1	1	1	366
3	30	—	181
4	14	—	63
—	21,&c.	—	101
—	23	4	84
—	2	—	88
5,19—21,25,26.		2.	455-6
5	46	2	199
6	41	1	63
—	68	—	69
7	17	7	280
—	46,49	2	334
10	18	—	206
11	14	—	420
—	42—5,7	—	421
—	51	1	57
12	11,17,18	2	421
—	32	1	58
13	34	5	187
14	2,3	3	361
15	16	7	278
16	16	3	320
17	3	1	360
—	17	—	121
21	22	—	259

ACTS.

1	20	3	205
—	25	—	202
2	26,27	—	299
—	27	2	240
4	29	5	233
7	48	1	121
—	59	2	206
9	31	1	270
10	35	2	206
16	1—3	5	474
17	6,7	—	483

Chap.	Ver.	Vol.	Page.
17	25	1	121
18	12	4	334
—	24,25	3	38
—	24,27	4	333
19	1,7	3	38
—	15	4	328
20	26,27	5	234
—	29,30	4	347
—	33	—	306
25	5	5	89
26	—	4	363
27	20	1	140
19	1,3	—	86

ROMANS.

1	22	1	59
2	28,29	4	363
3	8	—	274
—	7,8	5	238
4	11,17	3	360
5	1	—	392
—	10	—	130
6	8	4	274
9	20,22	4	—
10	2	4	408
—	4	2	199
—	9	7	288
—	17	1	147
12	16	4	330
13	8,10	—	417
14	7,9	2	325
—	17	1	121
15	4	7	281

I CORINTHIANS.

1	10	4	330
—	—	6	30
2	9	2	191
3	2	1	149
4	12	4	306
—	6	—	332
6	9,11	1	109
7	39	3	45
9	19,21—23	4	361 362
10	14	1	176
12	2	—	109
15	13,14	2	183
—	16,18	—	239
—	—	—	310
—	18	—	247
—	—	3	95
—	20	2	328
—	—	—	375
—	21	3	131
—	29	—	305
—	—	4	347
—	36	3	268
—	44,45	—	129 131
—	50	2	220
—	51	—	396
—	57	4	293

II CORINTHIANS.

1	24	4	306
—	—	5	529
3	6	4	417
5	1,6,8,9,10	2	228 231
6	17	—	206
12	2,3	—	239
—	17	4	306
—	23	3	356
13	2	4	330

GALATIANS.

1	10	4	306

Chap.	Ver.	Vol.	Page.
3	24	2	199
4	9	4	104
—	9	1	189
—	9,11	—	105
—	—	—	176

EPHESIANS.

1	16,19	4	428
2	20	1	201
3	14,19	4	428
4	13	1	63
—	17,19	—	109
6	1	3	203

PHILIPPIANS.

1	9,10	4	318
—	23,24	2	207
4	2	4	330
—	18	2	206

COLOSSIANS.

1	9	4	428
2	20,22	1	105
3	10,13	—	245
4	1	3	203

I THESSALONIANS.

4	17	2	220
5	14	—	112
—	21	—	113
—	19,20	1	69

II THESSALONIANS.

3	1,2	4	363
2	7	—	347

I TIMOTHY.

1	3	7	26
1	8,11	1	9,94
—	16	5	498
4	16	7	281
5	4	2	206
6	3	4	408

II TIMOTHY.

3	15,17	7	25
4	3	1	80
—	1,2	—	66

TITUS.

2	7,8	4	323
3	10	7	26

HEBREWS.

1	14	2	193
2	13	3	206
9	10	1	121
—	7	—	58
10	5	2	301
—	27	3	—
11	5	2	297
—	6	—	244
—	—	1	147
—	16	2	384
13	8	1	149

JAMES.

1	5	1	62
—	17	—	185
—	27	5	89
—	—	4	362
—	—	—	293
3	17	—	325

I PETER.

1	8	3	300
3	8	4	330

Chap.	Ver.	Vol.	Page.
3	18,20	3	301
4	3,4	1	110
—	7	3	201
5	3	2	116
—	—	5	529
—	5	1	62

II PETER.

1	5,15	1	147
3	8	3	361
—	2	1	195

I JOHN.

2	3,4	4	293
4	1	—	408

JUDE.

Chap.	Ver.	Vol.	Page.
	1	4	408
	16	—	264

REVELATIONS.

1	6	4	301
2	1,6	—	347
3	7	1	66
4	9,10	3	104
4	9	3	89
20	18,19	7	24

FINIS.

[*B. Flower, Printer, Cambridge*]

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01123 9367

DATE DUE

[illegible] 1954			
AUG 1-6 1956			
GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.